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1. Executive Summary

Amongst the objectives outlined in the European Union Strategy for the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2012-2015 (COM (2012) 6 final/2) it was stated that a study on animal welfare education would be undertaken. The main objective of this project was to identify the level of understanding of animal welfare issues within diverse groups and, where deficiencies were identified, to suggest means of improving knowledge levels through education and the dissemination of information. The study addressed two target groups referred to in broad terms as 'General public, students and consumers' and 'Professionals working with animals'.

The information was gathered from a representative sampling of each stakeholder group through face to face interviews, in selected Member States: Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden and the UK. Questionnaires were tailor-made for each specific group of respondents. In addition, a case study was undertaken in Austria.

The interviewees, 7,741 in total, included people with no direct connection to animal welfare issues, such as the general public, students and consumers. It also involved those actively employed in industries where animal welfare is an integral part of their working lives, from veterinarians to animal transporters and NGOs. Several in-depth interviews were also carried-out with key players in the field of animal welfare. In addition, the study identified activities relating to education and information on animal welfare aimed at both students and the general public which are currently in place at European level.

For the general public, students and consumers, the most obvious conclusion is that the level of knowledge amongst non-professionals is very limited despite the often laudable efforts of NGOs. This can only be addressed by a concerted, centrally-driven effort along with the active participation and collaboration of organisations in Member States. Students are seen as the most obvious target and it was generally believed that animal welfare would be better understood if it were introduced into the curriculum at an early age preferably combined with visits to commercial farms. There could also be greater use of all forms of media to help spread a strategic message. However, it is not suggested that information on animal welfare be provided in isolation. It is best presented when associated with other topics of importance to the general public, such as nutrition, health and sustainability.

With regard to the professional group, it is impossible to draw a single conclusion given that the level of training differs between professions. Unsurprisingly, veterinarians typically demonstrate more knowledge than many others working in related fields. This study recommends the creation of guidelines on animal welfare education for professionals, followed by the establishment of a standardised approach to assessing successes and impact.

This report presents the main findings of the study and the supporting arguments for the conclusions. Additional information is included in the appendix.

---

1 http://ec.europa.eu/food/animals/docs/aw_eu_strategy_19012012_en.pdf
2. Introduction

It has long been acknowledged in the European Union that animals are sentient beings. This is formally recognised by Article 13 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, which requires that full regard be given to the welfare requirements of animals in the formulation and enforcement of EU policies. The European Union Strategy for the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2012-2015 has been guided by this principle. It states that 'Animal welfare is a societal concern that appeals to a wide public. Treatment of animals relates to ethics and is part of the Union's set of values. It is therefore relevant to communicate to children, young adults or the public at large to raise awareness of respect for animals and to promote responsible ownership.' It also announces the intention to 'launch a study to map out the current animal welfare education and information activities directed at the general public and consumers'.

The study has now been completed and this report presents the findings.

In accordance with the terms of reference the following tasks were undertaken:

- Mapping of the current educational and informative activities in Europe
- Identification of successful and unsuccessful initiatives
- Analysis of where EU initiatives could provide improvements in animal welfare education
- Providing recommendations that could serve as a basis for future policies and actions in animal welfare

In order to achieve a balanced view, a distinction was made between educational and informative activities directed towards the general public and those intended for professionals working directly with animals.

Surveys were undertaken among these two groups in Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom to gather quantitative and qualitative information.
3. **Methodology**

Part one of the study considers "**Formal education and information to the general public, secondary and graduate level students and consumers**".

The first task consisted of face to face interviews:

- 1,916 respondents from the general public (64% female and 36% male) from 3 rural and 3 urban areas, and a mean age of 35 years old (ranging from 17 to 86). The interviews were carried out on the streets, in parks, cafeterias, etc.

- 1,952 secondary students (54% female and 46% male) from 6 schools per country (3 in rural and 3 in urban areas). The mean age ranged from 15 years in Sweden and the United Kingdom, 16 in Poland and Lithuania and 17 in Greece, Italy, Romania and Spain.

- 1,929 graduate students (58% female and 42% male) from 8 faculties per country (64 in total). In each country the communication, education, economics and engineering faculties at universities in the capital cities and the second largest city of each country (32) were visited. The mean age was 20 in Poland and Sweden, 21 in Greece; 22 in Lithuania, Romania, Spain, the United Kingdom and 23 in Italy.

- 1,944 consumers (67% female and 33% male) from 3 rural and 3 urban areas. The interviews were carried out either near a big supermarket (50%) or close to a traditional street market (50%). The mean age was 38 (ranging from 17 to 91 years old).

The questionnaires (appendices 1 to 4) consisted of 15 to 20 questions, depending on the category of respondents, and were designed to be answered in 15 minutes. The purpose of the questionnaires was to ascertain opinions on:

- animal welfare and ethics;
- level of knowledge on animal welfare and the quality of the information received;
- knowledge on animal welfare legislation;
- experience with farms and farmed animals,
- source of information.
- consumption habits (only consumers).

The questionnaires were developed with the same structure for the different categories of respondents to facilitate the comparison.

In addition, in Spain a subsample of secondary students was interviewed with the aim to ascertain the differences between students from agriculture, science and language/arts-oriented students.

The second task included:

- interviews with stakeholders, including producer associations, veterinary associations, NGOs and professors (appendices 13 to 22),
- discussion with several NGOs in the context of the AWARE project (appendix 23),
- workshop on animal welfare education carried out in Austria (appendix 24).
The third task involved the identification of the main activities in terms of generic and specific programmes on animal welfare in the EU, including the presence of animal welfare targeted at students and the general public.

The fourth task consisted in the identification and analysis of the educational systems in the surveyed countries (appendix 25).

The fifth task analysed two specific cases in more detail:

a) the Austrian educational system- the only one in Europe to have so far included animal welfare in the school curricula, in courses for teachers and in teaching magazines (both offered by “Tierschutz macht Schule”).

b) the Animal Behaviour and Welfare Courses organized by the University of Edinburgh.

**Vocational training for personnel working with animals**

Results of the interviews conducted within the first, second and third task of the study:

Table 1: Number of interviewed professionals by category and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional category</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Females (%)</th>
<th>Males (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>1218</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorry drivers</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouse personnel</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinarians and technicians</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pet shop personnel</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoo personnel</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Percentage of professionals working with different categories of animals*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Pigs (%)</th>
<th>Broilers (%)</th>
<th>Cattle (%)</th>
<th>Sheep &amp; goats (%)</th>
<th>Dogs and cats (%)</th>
<th>Others (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinarians and technicians</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the case of farmers, the 'Others' category included rabbits, horses, laying hens and fish, while for veterinarians this involved only horses and exotic animals. Some professionals were also working with several different species.

---

2 In Spain, a subsample of farmers and lorry drivers was included to assess their opinion on training undertaken on animal welfare.
Table 3: Mean years of experience and range of years of experience of the professionals by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Mean years of experience</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>1-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>1-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>1-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>1-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>1-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>1-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>1-35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The questionnaires contained between 15 and 20 questions depending on the category of respondents and were designed to be answered in 15 minutes. They assessed interviewees:

a) definition of animal welfare  
b) academic background and education on animal welfare  
c) sources of information  
d) specific issues related to their job (e.g. how farmers perceive the relationship of animal welfare to consumers, costs, etc.).

The fourth task was executed throughout the interviews with stakeholders, including producer associations, veterinary associations, NGOs and professors.

Within the fifth task the main activities on animal welfare in training programmes for professionals were identified.

The sixth task consisted of the revision of the current legislation on training in the 8 countries of the study.

Finally, within the framework of the seventh task, some specific cases were identified and further explained as examples for future proposals at European level.
4. Results from the questionnaires

4.1 Animal welfare and ethics

The first set of questions ascertained how people defined animal welfare, which species cause a higher concern and what their opinion is on the use of animals for different purposes (for more detailed results see appendices 1-4).

a) What do you think animal welfare means?

The answers were classified according to the following terms: suffering, happiness, other emotions, stress, feeding, housing, health, behaviour and natural conditions. These terms were subsequently grouped into two main clusters, those associated with the state of the animal (suffering, happiness, other emotions, stress and behaviour) and those associated with management and resources (housing, feeding, clean/healthy conditions and natural conditions).

Figures 1 and 2 summarise the terms used by secondary and graduate students. The results show, in some countries (i.e. Romania and the UK), an evolution in the way animal welfare is defined by graduate students as compared to secondary students.

Figure 1: What do you think animal welfare means? – Answers of secondary students
Figure 2: What do you think animal welfare means? – Answers of graduate students

The management and resource based terms were the most commonly used among all the categories of interviewees when defining animal welfare. Animal welfare is therefore not generally seen as something intrinsic to the animal but as something related to how animals are treated. This is an important point to take into account when communication on animal welfare is addressed because, while the science on animal welfare promotes animal based measures, the approach to animal welfare by society is based on resources and management conditions.

b) How much are you concerned about the welfare of domestic animals?

The welfare concern for most of the species was scored as moderate (from 5 to 6 in a scale 0 - 10).

Table 1: Secondary students’ concern about the welfare per species (mean values)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Greece</th>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Lithuania</th>
<th>Poland</th>
<th>Romania</th>
<th>Spain</th>
<th>Sweden</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laying hens</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy cows</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef cattle</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broilers</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory animals</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results show that pigs and broilers are the species generating higher levels of concern among students, than rabbits, goats and laying hens.

Consumers and the general public showed a similar level of concern for most of the species.

In general, the highest mean values of concern were observed in Greece and Spain. For instance, the general public in Greece gave laboratory animals a score of 8.4 and in Spain people gave pigs a score of 7.3. In countries such as Sweden and Poland, all animal species ranged between 4.7 and 5.8.

c) What is your level of agreement about the use of animals for working purposes; entertainment or sports; food production; fur production or killing animals when they are seriously injured or ill; observing animal behavior in an experiment; use of animals in medical experiments to improve human health; testing cosmetics or household products on animals; increasing animal’s health or disease resistance by genetic changes; inflicting pain or injury on animals as part of cultural traditions?
(Scale: 0-10 when 0 – means "Absolutely disagree", 5 – "Indifferent" and 10 –"Totally agree")

Few differences were observed between categories of respondents; with lower levels of agreement for secondary students compared to the others categories (mean value of 5.6 vs 7.3, respectively). The highest level of agreement was expressed for the statements on the use of animals for production of food/fur” (7.0 - 7.5) and killing animals when they are seriously injured or ill (5.5 - 6.5). All categories showed a low level of agreement with the statements on the use of animals in cultural traditions or for testing cosmetics (0.8 - 2.1). Agreement on the use of animals for behavioural studies or for human health purposes received a score of around 4 - 5.

4.2 Level of knowledge on animal welfare and quality of the information received

All categories of respondents were asked questions on how well informed they feel on animal welfare and what they think about the level of animal welfare in their countries. In addition, the third question addressed to secondary school students was on the quality of information on animal welfare received in their countries, while the general public, consumers and graduate students were asked whether they would like to be better informed.

All categories of respondents felt poorly informed on animal welfare. This perception was lower in Southern European countries such as Greece and Spain.

Opinions on the level of animal welfare in the respondent's countries were also similar across all categories of interviewees. Again, the average perception on the level of animal welfare was lower than 6.5 in all countries, with the lowest scores in southern countries: 2.0 in Greece and 4.0 in Spain.
Secondary students (1.9), consumers (2.0) and the general public (2.3) reported a low perception of the quality of information received. The quality of the information was assessed as moderately poor in Poland and Sweden, and extremely poor in countries such as Greece, Italy and Spain. Countries where people felt poorly informed (mainly Greece and Spain) were the same as those in which respondents called for more information on animal welfare.

### 4.3 Knowledge on animal welfare legislation

Three types of questions were asked to assess the knowledge of national legislation on animal welfare and the need for more legislation.

The average of correct answers was lower than 50% and was similar across all 4 categories (see the comparison between secondary and graduate students in Figures 4 and 5).
In Greece, Spain and Romania the percentage of correct answers was below 40%. These results match those in the previous section where, particularly in the case of Greece and Spain, respondents assessed their own level of knowledge of animal welfare as very low and the need for more information on animal welfare as high.

People with a low level of knowledge on existing national legislation on animal welfare strongly claim the need for more legislation (from 60% to 90% depending on the country).

4.4 Experience with farms and farmed animals

In the last set of questions interviewees were asked about their experience in commercial farms.

A high percentage of people (70%), regardless of the category, did not answer the questions on commercial farms correctly. This result suggests that visits to conventional farms might not be a common practice or that the knowledge gained in such visits does not match with the legal context.

The percentage of responders who had visited a farm were similar and high among the 4 categories (around 75%). This result is not in accordance with the poor knowledge showed on the conditions of animals in commercial farms. This might indicate that the farms visited were neither commercial farms nor intensive production systems.

4.5 Sources of information

Respondents were asked to indicate their sources of information on animal welfare (open question) and their credibility in a scale from 0- low to 10 - high. Different sources were mentioned: news, advertisements and specific programmes on TV and the radio, newspapers, specialized magazines, books, informative brochures, formative sessions, school training, visits to farms, product labelling, communication campaigns by private companies, governmental programmes and general news or specialized websites on the internet.

The TV and internet constitute the main source of information on animal welfare for 35% of respondents, with no outstanding differences found between categories of respondents. However, in Greece students did not report any main source of information on animal welfare, which is in accordance with the reported low level of their knowledge.
Although more than 70% of interviewees had visited a farm, they did not consider that as a main source of information on animal welfare. Graduate students considered governmental (with an average of 4.9) and private campaigns (with an average of 5.0) as the poorest sources of information on animal welfare.

In order to evaluate the level of knowledge on specific European labelling, the interviewees were asked the meaning of the first number of the code printed on eggs in the EU. The percentage of correct answers was below 8% for secondary students, consumers and general public, close to 0% in Italy and Greece. In Spain, none of the secondary students in agriculture, only 8% of the language/arts and 24% of the science students answered correctly.

### 4.6 Consumption habits

Consumers were asked about the consumption of animal products and the level of importance of the following aspects when buying meat, eggs and milk: leading brands, store brands, animal welfare, package type, origin, shelf life, fat content, salt content, price, nutritional information, organic production (answers ranged on a scale from 0 – "not important" to 10 – "very important").

Daily consumption of milk and eggs was reported to be higher than the consumption of meat. Broilers and pigs were the most often consumed in the meat category.

The three main aspects for consumers in their decision making process when buying animal products are shelf life, origin and price (Figure 6).

Figure 6: Importance for the consumers of different aspects when buying meat/eggs/milk.

(Scale from 0 – "not important" to 10 – "very important")

Animal welfare came in seventh place, with the highest results in the UK (6.89) and the lowest in Poland (5.33).

The results showed that the higher the consumption of pork, ham and broiler meat, the lower the value given to animal welfare as one of the aspects taken into consideration when buying meat.

In Sweden, the price of products is the least important aspect taken into consideration by consumers (3.9). The origin (8.6) and whether they come from organic production (8.4) come first. Based on these results it seems that a positive strategy to address animal welfare in Sweden (as well as in other countries) would be to associate the issue with the origin of products, as well as encouraging closer contact between local farmers and consumers (for example through farm visits).
5. Interviews with key stakeholders

a) The following stakeholders were interviewed in order to collect their opinions:

- COPA-COGECA (Committee of Professional Agricultural Organisations- General Committee for Agricultural Cooperation in the European Union)
- ANPROGAPOR (Asociación Nacional de Productores de Ganado Porcino/Spanish National Pig Producers Association)
- FVE (Federation of Veterinarians of Europe)
- FVO (Food and Veterinary Office)
- ECAWBM (European College of Animal Welfare and Veterinary Behavioural Medicine)
- Four journalists
- The coordinator of the Master's degree in “Animal Law and Society” of the Autonomous University of Barcelona (Spain)
- The chairman of animal welfare in the University of Cádiz (Spain)
- Eurogroup for Animals
- BFF (Born Free Foundation)
- FAADA (Fundación para el asesoramiento y acción en Defensa de los Animales/Spanish Foundation for Animal Protection)

A summary of the main points highlighted by the stakeholders is presented below (detailed opinions are presented in the appendices 13 – 23):

- School is the best place to promote education on animal welfare. Teachers should be trained and students must receive information adapted to their age.

- Students should be provided with objective information on farming practices through transparent communication and avoiding misleading messages. Animal welfare should be considered a part of a broader concept of animal production, where society respects both producers and animals.

- Education and information on animal welfare is mainly disseminated by NGOs, but NGOs want authorities to play a more active role.

- Producers do not believe the information provided by NGOs is objective and, equally, NGOs do not consider information provided by producers as objective.

- The use of tools such as guidelines, handbooks, games, open days at farms and in slaughterhouses, guest speakers in schools (veterinarians, farmers, NGOs representatives) should be encouraged by Member States.

- Consumers and the general public need more information on animal welfare, including responsible pet ownership. While the media tend to prioritize the lack of welfare or health crises, the TV and internet must be used more frequently to provide educational information on welfare issues.

- Professionals, such as lawyers, should have the possibility to study animal law as part of their university degree.
b) Meeting with NGO’s in the context of the AWARE project

The participants were Krzysztof Jedrzejewski (Eurogroup for Animals), Alexandra Hammond (RSPCA, Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals), Jelena Llic (ORCA - Organization for Respect and Care for Animals), Romana Sonkova (Compassion in World Farming), Miro Tulak (Association of Slovak Consumers) and Urska Markelj (independent consultant).

The main outcomes of the meeting are the following:

- NGOs considered that no specific policy dealing with training and information on animal welfare in the EU is relevant. On the other hand, education was considered to be the best way to improve animal welfare in the EU.

- NGOs expressed concern about the gap between consumer perception and the way animals are actually used in the food production. According to them, initiatives such as ‘Farmland’ do not help provide a realistic view about the realities of commercial production.

- According to NGOs, retailers have sometimes used strategies that hinder the delivery of clear and transparent information to consumers.

- All participants agreed on the need to develop European standards of education on animal welfare for children, the general public and consumers.

- NGOs demanded to officially take part in developing the standards, improve their representation and increase information to the general public. However, they find it difficult to access government funds to provide animal welfare information to citizens.

- Participants concluded that the responsibility to inform the general public could be supported by a national animal welfare reference centre in Member States.

c) Workshop on animal welfare education carried out in Austria

A workshop entitled “Animal Welfare Education in Austria” was held on 16th December 2013 in Vienna. The objectives were to:

- Provide an overview of animal welfare education programmes in Austria;
- Learn from past experiences and propose future options, such as the creation of a European Animal Welfare Education Reference Centre;
- Compare the situation in Austria with that in other Member States.

Various experts gave presentations on animal welfare education and the Austrian Animal Welfare Act, including representatives from the association "Tierschutz macht Schule," the formal education sector, consumers, professionals and people involved in practical educational initiatives in schools.

The main findings of the workshop are the following:

- The integration of animal welfare in school lessons has been made possible thanks to meetings with teachers and representatives of the Austrian education sector.

- The way animal welfare is included in the Austrian curricula reflects the way society deals with animals.
Criteria for successful animal welfare education are: the existence of a network of people from different backgrounds, the ability to exchange experiences and cooperation with experts and scientists.

Courses and e-learning programmes for teachers should be developed and accreditation of material should be defined. More cooperation between actors is needed.

The integration of animal welfare in school curricula would set a minimum standard to be met by all students and would make it easier for teachers to know what to include in their lessons.

Even in Austria, the amount of animal welfare contents imparted in lessons depends on the dedication of the teacher. Official funding is needed to help assess the degree of implementation and effectiveness of lessons.

There is an imbalance in how animal welfare is imparted in schools depending on the type of animals being addressed. Companion animals are emotionally more valued and are often covered in primary education, while farm animals are taught in secondary education and are discussed in more technical terms.

In Austria and Germany various animal welfare and ethical labels exist which can easily confuse consumers. An initiative for a new animal welfare labelling system, elaborated by international working groups to enable consumers to easily assess how animal friendly a product is, would be very welcome.

Information supplied to consumers should address: animal husbandry, positive and negative aspects of animal welfare, the animal welfare assessment applied, the human welfare/working conditions and details relating to the production chain as a whole (such as feed, rearing, slaughtering and product processing).

(The full report from the workshop can be found in Appendix 24)

5.1 Identification of activities at European level

A list of NGOs, universities, research institutes and other organisations, public bodies and private companies were consulted on generic and specific activities on animal welfare (the complete list is shown in appendix 12).

The information obtained from this consultation mainly concerns students and the general public.

a) Information/education on animal welfare targeted at students

Austria

Most activities in Austria were carried out by the institution “Tierschutz macht Schule” which has developed teaching materials on animal welfare for primary and secondary education. These materials offer captivating and exciting stories, riddles and hands-on activities, avoiding the use of shocking or disturbing images. The aim is to introduce children to animal welfare issues from a very early age, starting in nurseries and in schools, and are therefore adapted to different age groups. Teachers can order class sets free of charge directly from “Tierschutz macht Schule” paying only for the delivery fee of the magazines. The “Stable Schools” and “Cow Practitioner” projects aim to create a motivating surrounding and ownership as well as facilitating animal welfare to farmers.

3 http://www.tierschutzmachtschule.at/verein/taetigkeiten.htm
The “Pet Buddy” project aims to give children and youngsters a practical experience of animal welfare. Teachers have the possibility of booking courses for their classes which involve two day visits to an animal shelter and the “pet’s area” at the Vienna Zoological Garden, where they learn about the needs and behaviour of pets. Key messages on animal welfare are communicated and children also learn how to pass on their knowledge to others.

Finland

The Finnish Centre for Animal Welfare (EHK) has created a new animal welfare information website targeted at the general public and children.4

The Finnish Member Organisation (SEY) runs the “Animal Week”, a campaign organized every year in early October which targets children and young people. Members choose a specific topic or animal species and prepare educational materials for schools. In 2013, the materials were targeted at 80,000 students. Teachers are also informed about the elaboration of these materials and can ask to use them.

Serbia

The ORCA organisation (Organization for Respect and Care of Animals) in Serbia has been conducting the Animal Welfare Education programme “ORCA Education” since 2002. The initiative targets teachers, children and teenagers through local school actions, internet presentations and media reports (newspapers and electronic publications) with the aim of systematically integrating animal welfare into the Serbian education system. The project has introduced animal welfare to more than 2000 teachers and 5000 children and teenagers participating in their workshops and promotional activities. During 2009-2010, the Institute for Sustainable Communities and the U.S. Government Cooperation Agency (USAID), both US-based but working at an international level, supported ORCA’s project aimed at the development of guidelines for the integration of animal welfare in the national education system. Shortly afterwards, animal welfare was included in the curricula of the “Nature and Society” subject for the first education cycle in Serbia (I-IV grade of elementary school, corresponding to 6-10 year old children).5

The Netherlands

The Vote for Animals Foundation (“Stichting Stem voor Dieren”) is an organization committed to education on animal welfare in the Netherlands and abroad. It develops educational welfare projects for children and teenagers. The objective is to target groups of different ages and develop educational packages for up to 18 years of age. The Foundation has published an educational book on animal welfare called Valentine’s Terrible Holiday for 8-9 year old children to help them learn how to take proper care of their pets. The organization also distributes brochures at animal retailers and zoos.6

The Dutch animal protection organization, “Dierenbescherming”, has developed teaching materials for education.7 Primary school teachers can play the Animal Guardian game with their students, a series of video clips through which they can learn about animals in a fun and engaging way. For the first stage of secondary education the foundation has developed Thinking about Animals, where students learn about different animal issues and the role of animals in society through films, photos and texts. The organisation has created its own youth club, Kids for Animals where they organise campaigns and courses for the general public on topics such as first aid for animals and dog training.8 The organisation has developed an online animal welfare course, a joint initiative with the Green Knowledge Cooperative Development Centre. The course aims to help understand and assess animal welfare while gaining an understanding of animal ethics. Theory is supported by practical examples, dilemmas and case studies. Materials for teachers have also been developed for primary school lessons (10-12 year old pupils) and early

4 http://elaintenhyvinvointikeskus.edublogs.org/
5 http://www.orca.org.rs
6 www.stemvoordieren.nl
7 www.dierenbescherming.nl
8 http://kidsforanimals.dierenbescherming.nl/
secondary education (12-14-year-old ones). Assignments are developed with the agreement and advice of education specialists.

The organisation’s website also has a section dedicated to young people where information on a wide range of topics, from rearing chickens to slaughterhouse issues, is provided to encourage them to learn more about farm animals.

The Institute for Animals in Philosophy and Science (“Instituut voor dieren in filosofie en wetenschap” - IDFW) organises lectures, seminars and courses with the purpose of changing attitudes towards animals. The institute focuses on the way people think about animals in philosophy and science. They aim to disseminate scientific knowledge about animals, present different philosophical positions and arguments from sub-disciplines of philosophy (ethics, anthropology) and promote a debate within the general public. The institute began with a special children's lecture called "Animals can think and feel," for children aged between 8 and 12.9

Sweden

The NGO Animal Welfare Sweden (Djurskyddet Sverige) developed the REDE initiative, an acronym of Respect, Empathy, Animals and Ethics. The objective is to develop a respectful approach towards animals, humans and nature for all children in Sweden. REDE is a collection of teaching materials for school children and mini-REDE is aimed specifically at primary school children. The rationale is that all animals should be able to express their natural behaviour and that their welfare should be improved. Currently it has 4,800 registered users.10

United Kingdom

The International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) has an Animal Action Education programme to empower young people and communities to take positive action for animals, and aims at inspiring young people to understand, respect and protect animals. Funded in the UK in 1993, the programme now reaches classrooms, youth groups and families in more than 18 countries. Focused on a variety of animal welfare and conservation themes, the programme provides free resources aligned with core curricula in eight languages plus Braille. The Animal Action Education programme foresees to engage about 5,000,000 teachers, students and parents worldwide from autumn 2013. The resources used are DVD packs that include a teaching guide with a student's magazine, lessons and worksheets, classroom films and posters, as well as local, community and globally coordinated activities.11

International and European Scope

Eurogroup for Animals provides materials by means of their 48 like-minded organisations. This group is recognised by the European Parliament and Commission as a leading animal welfare organisation at EU level and represents animal welfare interests on many EU advisory committees and consultation bodies.12

The World Animal Protection's Animal Mosaic offers expertise on the science of animal sentience, education, disaster management and legislation. The website provides several tools: materials for teaching, guidelines for educators, guidelines to monitor the effectiveness of educational activities and a guide on how to integrate animal welfare education into teaching. The website has a resources section with a wealth of downloadable documents, videos and links on a wide variety of animal welfare issues.13

The European Union developed Farmland, a virtual game where players rear farm animals in an animal-welfare-friendly way, aimed at promoting the education of children and young people on issues such as

---

9 www.diereninfilosofieenwelenschap.wordpress.com
10 http://www.djurskyddet.se
11 http://www.ifaw.org/european-union
12 http://www.eurogroupforanimals.org/
13 http://www.animalmosaic.org/about/
animal welfare and positive consumer behaviour. Players learn about the life cycles and needs of pigs, chickens, laying hens, cattle and calves and what food they produce.\(^\text{14}\)

\textbf{b) Information on animal welfare targeted at the general public}

\textbf{Finland}

The Finnish Centre for Animal Welfare (EHK) aims to inform the public about animal welfare and has created a website with information about animal welfare related topics, including farm animals, companion animals, legislation and results from different studies.\(^\text{15}\)

\textbf{France}

The “30 Millions d’Amis” foundation promotes the rights of animals and aims to create awareness among the general public on animal welfare issues through magazines and TV programmes. The foundation mainly focuses on companion animals though sometimes tackles news/issues related to wild animals.\(^\text{16}\)

\textbf{Germany}

Four Paws Germany (VIER PFOTEN Deutschland) is an international organization for the protection of animals that seeks to help animals through campaigns and projects. The foundation organizes campaigns for companion animals, farm animals and wildlife. It provides information about all their campaigns through their website and also elaborates specific informative material for the public upon request through the website and free of charge.\(^\text{17}\)

\textbf{The Netherlands}

The Nationwide Informative and Educational site on the welfare of pets (Landelijk informative Centrum gezelschapsdieren; LICG) is managed by the Dierenbescherming, Groenhorst College Barneveld, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine of Utrecht, Department of Economic Affairs, Wageningen University & Research and the Dutch National Veterinary College/Association (Koninklijke Nederlandse Maatschappij voor Diergeneeskunde, KNMvD). The website has a section aimed at the general public in which campaigns and other information about pets and exotic animals are promoted.\(^\text{18}\)

“Dierenbescherming” is a Dutch animal protection organization that provides information about companion and farm animals to the general public through campaigns and courses such as first aid for animals and dog training. The website contains a section on legislation concerning farm animals, pets, wildlife and experimentation animals.\(^\text{19}\)

“Wakker Dier” is an organisation that provides information about different farm animals and their welfare to the general public. The website has a specific section which shows how the cattle industry in the Netherlands deals with and handles animals.\(^\text{20}\)

The Institute for Animals in Philosophy and Science (Instituut voor dieren in filosofie en wetenschap; IDFW) holds lectures, seminars and courses contributing to a change in attitudes towards animals.\(^\text{21}\)

\textbf{Spain}

\(^\text{14}\) http://www.farmland-thegame.eu/
\(^\text{15}\) http://www.elaintieto.fi/home.aspx
\(^\text{16}\) http://www.30millionsdansis.fr/
\(^\text{17}\) http://www.vier-pfoten.de/
\(^\text{18}\) http://www.licg.nl/?a/home.html
\(^\text{19}\) www.dierenbescherming.nl
\(^\text{20}\) www.wakkerdier.nl
\(^\text{21}\) www.diereninfilosofienwetenschap.wordpress.com
The National Association for the Defence of Animals (ANDA) performs different activities with regard to information targeted at the general public. Most of their activities are focused on pets; however they also support initiatives for farm animals such as “Better Dairy”.22

5.2 Analysis of the educational systems in Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom

The objective of this task was to identify whether animal welfare or any related issues were included in the educational programmes for secondary education in the countries of the study as a compulsory or optional subject. The review of the school programmes showed that animal welfare (or related issues such as animal production, pets or wild animals) is not included in any national educational programme, nor in the national curricula, neither as a compulsory or optional subject (appendix 25). However, teachers can introduce topics on animal welfare at their discretion and under their responsibility.

In most countries the concept of animal welfare is integrated in pre-school education by means of games and pictures.

In the UK animal welfare is mentioned in the pre-school curriculum.

In Lithuania, secondary students have the possibility to choose subjects in accordance with their interests. In Poland, studies include cross-curricular themes and educational pathways covering topics such as ecological education or education for society, in which animal welfare could also be included.

In Sweden, animal welfare or related topics are not mentioned as such in the school programme, but Swedish teachers normally include some aspects of animal welfare on a voluntary basis.

5.3 Highlighted cases

5.3.1 Analysis of the educational system in Austria

The Austrian educational system was studied in more detail as it is the only country in Europe to have included animal welfare in the school curricula. Six questions were addressed to eight teachers dealing with this subject.

The main points of the analysis are summarised below while the complete information can be found in appendix 26.

How many hours per year/course are dedicated to animal welfare issues in secondary schools?
Animal welfare is mentioned as a “teaching principle” in the curricula which means that teachers have to cover the issue but they are free to decide how to teach it and how much time they dedicate to it.

Under which modules or subjects is animal welfare included in the programmes?
The teaching principle named “Environmental Education” includes paragraphs on the importance of fostering the idea of animal welfare and providing interaction and personal experiences with animals. It encourages a deeper understanding of animal welfare and the inclusion of the “World Animal Welfare Day” in class projects. This teaching principle should be followed in all teaching subjects.

In the curricula for primary education (ages 6 to 10) animal welfare is included in the General Studies (Sachunterricht). In stage I of the curricula for secondary education (ages 10 to 14) the term “animal welfare” as such is not mentioned. However, the Biology curriculum includes the request to teach about

22 http://www.andacentral.org/
pets in the first grade and about farm animals in the third grade. Whether these topics are presented in connection with animal welfare, or related to physiology and behaviour depends on the teacher. In stage II of secondary education (ages 14 to 19) the curriculum for Biology in Academic Secondary Schools includes “Animals and biodiversity” and “Animal breeding and genetic engineering”.

Aside from the school curriculum and accredited school books there are various animal welfare organisations that also provide teaching materials, workshops and excursions on animal welfare issues.

**Does teaching include practical experiences?**

Teachers are free to decide, for example, whether they want to organize a farm visit or take part in other initiatives such as the “Pet Buddy” program offered by “Tierschutz macht Schule”.

**Are there differences between schools?**

Differences can be found, for instance, between vocational schools (where animal welfare is often mentioned in the studies related to animals) and academic secondary schools. Within academic secondary schools around the country, minimum requirements for teaching animal welfare are set in the curricula. However, the degree to which animal welfare is taught is mainly dependent on the teachers themselves and/or on the school's policy.

**Who designs the educational programs and decides on the commitment to animal welfare?**

The Ministry of Education and Women’s Affairs decides about the educational programs.

**Do some of these initiatives include involving parents or other relatives?**

Parents are generally not particularly involved but, when they are, it is rather in connection with younger children; sometimes they join school trips as supervisors.

### 5.3.2 Animal welfare course for teachers offered by “Tierschutz macht Schule”

The animal welfare course for teachers provided by “Tierschutz macht Schule” is a unique offer in the field of animal welfare education at school in Europe. The course entitles teachers to continuing professional development (CPD) credits. Animal welfare is therefore integrated into the state education system on a larger scale. The course has a national impact and brings together experts from different fields, including education, animal welfare, ethics, law and biology, to ensure that animal welfare education based on scientific fact is passed on to a wider public.

"Tierschutz macht Schule" created a course in conjunction with Austrian teacher training colleges to provide teachers with the opportunity to become animal welfare instructors. The aim of the course is to enable teachers to impart sound animal welfare knowledge based on current scientific research. In two semesters and eleven weekends (16 teaching units each), participants learn about the behaviour, needs and husbandry requirements of pets, farm animals, horses, wild animals and laboratory animals. Topics such as animal welfare ethics and law as well as different educational tools are also an important part of the program. The first course was held in 2010/2011 and, since then, they have completed three teacher training courses. A total of 43 participants have successfully completed the course. The feedback from participants shows that teaching units on animal welfare are very popular. Course participants become key multipliers. "Tierschutz macht Schule" has established a separate page on their website to introduce animal welfare instructors and enable schools to book them directly. Schools are able to contact individual instructors via the website and to agree on specific topics. So far, course participants have taught as animal welfare instructors in other schools on over 70 occasions (Appendix 27).
5.3.3 Animal welfare teaching magazines produced by "Tierschutz macht Schule"

The teaching magazines provide sound factual information based on current scientific research. "Tierschutz macht Schule" relies on a large community of well-known animal welfare experts and a scientific advisory board to offer input and review the materials during their conception. The University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences in Vienna helps "Tierschutz macht Schule" to evaluate some of the magazines. The interdisciplinary approach and the collaboration of a community of experts including scientists and practitioners contribute to the success of the materials. They support them on a voluntary basis. Professional writers transform the facts into lively, exciting and target-group specific language to allow pupils a creative approach to the topics.

The aim of these materials is to introduce children to the natural requirements and behaviour of animals, conveying an understanding of animal-friendly husbandry. The materials avoid using shocking or disturbing images. Each teaching magazine features a cartoon character that encourages and guides children through the topic. This character appears throughout the magazine and creates a dramatic tension. In order to reach a maximum number of children and young people, materials suitable for different age groups have been created. In the period from 2008 to 2013, 2,500 educational institutions ordered 376,738 "Tierschutz macht Schule" teaching magazines (Appendix 28).

a) Animal Behaviour and Welfare Courses organized by the University of Edinburgh

Two researchers from IRTA followed the online course ‘Animal Behaviour and Welfare’ organised by the University of Edinburgh. The course aims to teach the concept of animal welfare, how to develop an understanding about the main welfare issues, behavioural needs and emotions of dogs, cats, farmed animals and captive wildlife animals. The course is open-access to all types of public, with any educational background, professional experience or age. It lasts 5 weeks, with each week addressing a specific topic: week one introduces the history and general concepts of animal welfare; week two focuses on animal behaviour and animal welfare assessment; week three looks at companion animal welfare (dogs and cats); week four covers farm animals (societal concerns and the application of a scientific understanding of animal welfare within a variety of production systems but focusing only on cows, pigs and poultry) and week five focuses on captive wild animals with key welfare issues relating to the management of captive wild animals in zoos. The course has been followed by around 30,000 students from 152 countries around the world.

The educational tools of the course are:
1. Forums: a virtual place where students and teachers meet to share their views and ideas, promoting debates about specific issues related to the course topics. Students can also address questions.
2. Google Hangouts: Teachers select and present popular questions and answers.
3. Video lectures as the main learning tool. Each week, teaching staff present a set of videos and features to instruct students about the issues to be addressed in relation to a specific topic. The videos last for about 3 to 18 minutes and can be reproduced by the students as many times as needed.
4. Interactive sessions: two interactive sessions are carried out to allow students to learn about Production cycles and Live animal transport. In addition, supplementary learning resources downloadable in PDF are available, to allow students to look into certain topics in more depth.

http://www.tierschutzmachtschule.at/en/material/teaching-magazines
https://www.coursera.org/course/animal
6. **General discussion on formal education and information to the general public, students and consumers**

There is a common agreement that animal welfare should be part of the educational curricula targeted at all ranges of age.

Guidance on animal welfare education in secondary and graduate studies not related to animals is scarce in most of the assessed countries.

The majority of stakeholders (NGOs, producer associations, veterinary associations, journalists, etc.) brought up the fact that not enough effort has been made by the competent authorities to introduce animal welfare in the educational system. However, some initiatives identified by the study have been supported by the competent authorities, (i.e. in Austria - the Association "Tierschutz macht Schule" and in Finland-Finnish Centre for Animal Welfare).

The results show that producer associations do not trust the content on animal welfare that has been created by NGOs, and likewise, NGOs do not trust some professionals that are in charge of these types of tasks.

Some stakeholders proposed the creation of an independent European animal welfare education centre responsible for all relevant aspects: content, methodology, standardisation, harmonisation, monitoring and assessment of educational activities in the EU. Such a centre would also interact with the main stakeholders: NGOs, producers and competent authorities.

Educators constitute another key element for the successful implementation of animal welfare in the education system. In Austria, where animal welfare is included in the educational program of secondary schools, the content, duration and methodology are entirely dependent upon the teachers' criteria.

In countries where animal welfare is not included in secondary education programmes, teachers of biology, ethics or science might provide information on animal welfare if they consider it appropriate. Several initiatives for teachers aiming to explain animal welfare concepts were organised, e.g. summer courses or camps, visits to farms or invitation of farmers to schools.

Some active players in the field (e.g. "Tierschutz macht Schule") suggested that teachers should be incentivized and receive prior training. For this purpose they suggest organizing courses for educators and facilitating them to follow these training sessions, e.g. through on-line courses, with the support and funding of schools and/or the Ministry of Education.

Differences between EU countries exist in terms of student knowledge and perception of animal welfare. In Greece, Italy and Spain, students perceive themselves to be less informed and to have information of poorer quality. No great differences were found in the percentages of correct answers to questions on animal welfare legislation within these three countries, although Greece, the country with the lowest percentage of correct answers, also showed the highest percentage of students calling for more legislation on animal welfare (around 90%). This correlation has also been found for other categories, such as consumers and citizens, underlining the importance of providing the general public with information about what is already regulated in the EU and to ensure that that information reaches them. The percentage of correct answers among secondary and graduate students (not related to animal science) as well as of the general public and consumers are very similar (around 39% for each category). In this case the level of knowledge on animal welfare does not increase with age.
Despite the fact that the average level of knowledge on animal welfare legislation is quite similar among all the groups, the specific views differ. For instance, in the opinion of secondary students, broilers and pigs appeared as the species that caused the highest concern. In the case of consumers, answers regarding these two species showed a relationship with their consumption habits: the higher the consumption, the lower their concern for the species.

The questions related to legislation also evaluated the level of knowledge about commercial farms; i.e. the question about limited groups of 4 individuals in the pen. While 75% of respondents reported to have visited a farm at least once, the percentage of correct answers was between 25% and 39%. These results would suggest that either the farms they visited were non-conventional farms or the visits themselves were not sufficient to show the reality of production systems. The answers provided by consumers and citizens are quite similar in this respect.

Regarding the credibility of different information sources on animal welfare, graduate students and consumers pointed at farm visits as the most important source (mean values 7 and 7.2, respectively). Stakeholders highlighted the importance of visits to commercial farms to show what happens in current production systems.

Concerning opinions on the use of animals for different purposes, the highest level of disagreement (so the lowest score) was expressed for “animals used in cultural traditions” and in the “experimentation context”. The main values of answers, on a scale from 0-10 (0- absolutely disagree, 10- totally agree) for the respective categories of respondents were:

To the question "Do you agree with inflicting pain or injury on animals as part of cultural traditions?":
- secondary students - 1.4
- graduate students - 1.2
- consumers - 0.8
- citizens - 0.9

To the question "Do you agree that medical experiments use animals to improve human health?":
- secondary students - 2.1
- graduate students - 2.3
- consumers - 2.1
- citizens - 1.9

The highest agreement was expressed for keeping animals for the production of food:
- secondary students - 4.7
- graduate students - 7.3
- consumers - 7.4
- citizens - 7.0.

Producer associations and law professors suggested addressing education on animal welfare for secondary students by looking more closely at respect for animals and our responsibilities as individuals and as a society. Educational initiatives should be age specific: in fact, according to “Tierschutz macht Schule” and IFAW, it has been proven that children between 11 - 14 years old are more receptive and capable of feeling empathy than students between 15-17 years old. Animal welfare education for older students should therefore be approached from a more technical point of view, while for younger students it would be more efficient to approach the issue from an emotional perspective.

Producer associations also claim that the social value of farmers and their contribution to society as food providers should be explained, particularly to more mature students, for their role and work in industrialized societies to be better recognized.
When asked about the meaning of animal welfare, all respondents used terms related to ‘inputs’ (what the animals are provided with in terms of management and environment) instead of ‘outcomes’ or animal based terms (i.e. if the animals are in good condition, clean, not thirsty or hungry, not bruised from crowding or aggression, etc.).

In Spain, secondary science students showed a higher knowledge on egg codification than arts students. These results might suggest that science teachers tend to include animal welfare issues in their lectures more often than teachers from non-bioscience disciplines. Furthermore, the survey showed that knowledge on the codification and labelling of eggs according to the production system is almost non-existent in all countries. The legislation was therefore not supported by an efficient communication strategy.

Results of the study reveal that graduate student knowledge on animal welfare does not improve after leaving secondary school. These issues would possibly be better addressed in secondary education stages. However, as commented by the FVE, it is not clear if including animal welfare education for students working towards a bachelor’s degree in areas not related to animal science would be necessary. Animal welfare education is highly recommended in degrees where future professionals will be involved in informing society, such as education, journalism or law.

In general terms, the less informed about animal welfare people feel, the more they ask for more information to be provided. The most credible sources of information for consumers are farm visits and specific programmes or documentaries. The TV and internet are the most frequently used sources to obtain such information, so strengthening their use would help to improve communication and reach the general public.
7. Vocational training for personnel working with animals

7.1 Interviews with farmers, lorry drivers and slaughterhouse personnel

a) Definition of animal welfare

The first set of questions aimed to ascertain how professionals define animal welfare. The same type of term clusters as those aimed at the general public were used.

All three categories of professionals defined animal welfare mainly in terms of ‘inputs’ (e.g. on the basis of the care or management received by animals). This trend stands out particularly among farmers, while for lorry drivers, terms relating to ‘behaviour’ or ‘stress and suffering’ in the case of slaughterhouse personnel, were mentioned more often. The use of these ‘outcomes’ terms may indicate that these are critical aspects of their daily routines (see figure 7).

Figure 7: Terms used by farmers, lorry drivers and slaughterhouse personnel to define animal welfare

b) Academic background and education on animal welfare

This set of questions had the aim of ascertaining the academic background of professionals working with animals on farms, during transport and at slaughterhouses as well as their level of education on animal welfare. The questionnaire included a question about their certificate of competence in the management and slaughtering of animals in the slaughterhouse.

The academic background of lorry drivers was higher than that of farmers and slaughterhouse personnel.

A high percentage of lorry drivers and slaughterhouse personnel attended courses on animal welfare, with the exception of Spain and Greece, who registered lower numbers.

Although education on animal welfare for pig and broiler producers is mandatory in the EU, pig and broiler farmers with animal welfare training were far below 100%. Only in Spain and in the UK had most of the farmers been trained. In these two countries the time interval between two courses is the longest, meaning that after a first period of elementary education on the issue, no refresher or supplementary courses are offered to farmers. Greece had the lowest percentage of farmers trained in animal welfare and the longest interval since the last course was taken. This might be due to a lack of implementation of a plan for animal welfare education among farmers. Finally, the percentages of certified farmers working with laying hens and other species were also low, revealing other areas that should also be addressed in the future.

Perception of knowledge on animal welfare was similar among the different categories of professionals ranging from 6 to 8 (in the scale 0-"no knowledge" to 10- "high knowledge". Professionals in Sweden and
in the UK usually registered higher scores than those in other countries, particularly in comparison to those in Romania and Spain.

A comparison between farmers specialized in different species of animals showed that farmers working with pigs and broilers (for whom instruction on animal welfare is mandatory in the EU) viewed themselves as having a higher level of knowledge on animal welfare than others, especially in comparison to farmers working with laying hens, who also have a low level of education on animal welfare.

Finally, lorry drivers and slaughterhouse personnel were asked specific questions to assess their awareness of the legal requirements specified in Regulations EC 1/2005 and EC 1099/2009. Results revealed that lorry drivers were more aware of Regulation EC 1/2005 than slaughterhouse personnel were of Regulation EC 1099/2009.

Levels of knowledge on specific legislation differ between countries, even though this is not always related to the level of training received. In Sweden, despite a high number of courses, professionals did not show a better knowledge of legislation. A low level of knowledge of the specific legal requirements in the two regulations shows that these were not covered during the training.

c) Sources of information

All three categories of interviewed professionals said they received updated information on animal welfare. This view was shared in particular by lorry drivers in Spain and slaughterhouse personnel in Greece and in Spain.

A country comparison revealed that lorry drivers and slaughterhouse personnel in Poland, Lithuania and Sweden feel they are well informed and are also offered specific conferences and courses on the issue, while in Italy, Greece and Spain these professionals felt less informed. They indicated their main sources of information as specialized internet websites (Greece) and regional governments (Italy and Spain).

d) Farmers perception of the relationship between costs of animal welfare and the market

Farmers were asked the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absolutely disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Slightly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Slightly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Totally agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0: Absolutely disagree 5: Indifferent 10: Totally agree

Higher welfare production is properly rewarded by the market

The cost implications of improving animal welfare on farm is high

Price premiums for high welfare products in comparison with production costs are not acceptable

Consumers are demanding improved farm animal welfare

Consumers are willing to pay a higher price for higher welfare products

Food retailers require higher welfare standards
The statistical analysis of the data showed significant difference between countries. For instance, Greek, Italian, Lithuanian and Spanish farmers highly agreed on the high cost of animal welfare. Polish, Romanian, Swedish and British indicated that the cost is low-intermediate. In the UK, Sweden and Spain, farmers were more often of the opinion that there are high requirements imposed by the retailers than in other countries. In Spain farmers also declared a high cost to improve animal welfare and high demand from retailers to do it.

Figure 9 shows farmers views of consumer expectations regarding animal welfare products and their prices. The results reveal great differences between countries. Farmers in Sweden, the UK and Greece expressed the highest levels of agreement on the statement regarding consumers’ demand for improved farm animal welfare, while Romania, Italy and Spain had the lowest.

On the other hand, farmers agreed that consumers’ willingness to pay for animal welfare is very high in Sweden, while it is lower in the UK and very low in all the other countries, particularly in Romania and Spain. Greece showed the biggest difference between consumers’ high demands for improved animal welfare and a low willingness to pay for it. Farmers in Spain gave lower scores than in other countries regarding consumer interest for animal welfare, while the interest of retailers on the issue was high.
Figure 10: Farmers views on a rewarded market for animal welfare products and on the price premiums for high animal welfare products

Farmers in Greece, Sweden and the UK think that animal welfare products are rewarded by the market and that price premiums for these products are not low. For farmers in Poland, Romania and Spain, animal welfare is not rewarded by the market. Polish and Italian farmers agreed most often that the cost of animal welfare products is indeed low.

7.2 Interviews with veterinarians, technicians and personnel working with animals in an experimentation context

Most veterinarians and technicians interviewed reported professional experience with more than one species, including companion animals (mainly dogs and cats), farm and exotic animals.

Researchers most commonly worked with rodents, mammals other than pigs and primates (such as rabbits and small ruminants) and birds.

a) Definition of animal welfare

When defining "animal welfare", both veterinarians and technicians use words related to ‘inputs’ (i.e. how animals are treated or managed) most frequently. In comparison to students, consumers, the general public and even farmers, terms such as suffering, behaviour or stress were more frequently used.

b) Education on animal welfare

Both types of professionals reported having received professional training on animal welfare (60-68%), although a high variability between countries was observed. The older the veterinarians and technicians, the less frequently they followed a specific training on animal welfare. In some countries, two years had passed since their last training session.

When asked about their perception of their level of animal welfare knowledge, values were similar among both types of professionals, although the range was higher in the case of researchers (from 8.3 to 5.7, depending on the country) than in the case of veterinarians and technicians (from 7.9 to 6.5).

The level of knowledge on specific requirements of EU legislation regulating animal welfare in their workplaces was found to be rather low for both groups of respondents (from 34% to 66%).
c) Sources of information

Veterinarians considered their own experience as the main source of information on animal welfare. However, only 8% of those interviewed considered information coming from other colleagues as a relevant source of information.

Substantial differences emerged between researchers from different countries as to the possibility of obtaining easily updated information: from 90% of positive answers in Sweden, Italy and Lithuania to 27% in Romania.

7.3 Interviews with pet shop and zoo personnel

a) Definition of animal welfare

The main terms used to define animal welfare by this category of respondents were “inputs” based (e.g., resources or management). Only 10% of personnel working in pet shops mentioned "stress" and 15% mentioned "behaviour". In the case of personnel working in zoos, "stress" was used by 21% while 28% used "behaviour", both higher proportions than other categories of interviewees.

b) Academic background and training on animal welfare

Around 40% of people working in pet shops and zoos reported having a secondary level of education. Zoo personnel believe they are better trained in animal welfare than pet shop personnel, although in both cases the percentages were high (60-70%).

80% of personnel working in pet shops in Sweden and 93% of those in Romania admitted that killing an ill or injured animal was part of their work. Therefore a better background on animal welfare would have been expected among these workers than what was found.

In general, workers in zoos feel better informed than workers in pet shops. Romania and Spain, who have the largest numbers of veterinarians and veterinary assistants working in pet shops, were also the countries with highest average scores on the level of self-assessment of animal welfare knowledge of the two professions.

People working in zoos were considerably more aware of the animal welfare legislation applying to their workplace (40%) than personnel in pet shops (10%). It appears that the legislative aspect is often not included in the training for pet shop personnel.

c) Sources of information

The main sources of information on animal welfare for the zoo personnel are colleagues, managers and specialized magazines. They considered access to updated information to be quite easy.

In the case of pet shop personnel, specialized internet websites were also considered to be a very important source of information.
8. **Interviews with key stakeholders**

The following stakeholders were interviewed in order to collect their opinion:

- COPA-COGECA (Committee of Professional Agricultural Organisations- General Committee for Agricultural Cooperation in the European Union).
- ANPROGAPOR (Asociación Nacional de Productores de Ganado Porcino//Spanish National Pig Producers Association)
- FVE (Federation of Veterinarians of Europe)
- FVO (Food and Veterinary Office)
- ECAWBM (European College of Animal Welfare and Veterinary Behavioural Medicine)
- Four journalists
- The chairman of animal welfare in the University of Cádiz (Spain)
- Eurogroup for Animals
- BFF (Born Free Foundation)

The entire content of the stakeholders’ opinions can be found in the appendices 13 to 22. A summary of the main points highlighted by these different stakeholders are presented below:

- **Initiatives on welfare education** should be promoted by public authorities, farmer organisations, expert groups and veterinarian associations. High quality training on animal welfare could be offered by expert institutions, for a fee.

- **Farmers are mostly willing** to take part in training activities if they see them as a way of improving the economic performance of their farms. The main obstacles for not attending courses vary from lack of help on the farm while the farmer is away, lack of financial support or even the irrelevance of the course to individual farmers’ needs. Highlighting animal welfare in particular is viewed as positive but it would be better to train farmers on aspects that are part of normal management routines. Farmers and producers should receive social recognition both for the work they do and for doing it correctly.

- **Farmers also need information training**, not only related to vocational training but also concerning consumers’ expectations and how to achieve a closer relationship with them.

- **In some Member States there is a lack of training for official veterinarians**. Appropriate welfare training is also missing for official veterinarians in certain fields where specialist expertise is crucially needed (e.g. zoo inspections).

- **More training for professionals working with animals** should be made available. Such training initiatives should be subject to appropriate auditing and review to assess their efficiency.

- **Too often the “recognised experience” of professionals has hindered the development of proper training.** This has been the case for broiler keepers and slaughterhouse personnel.

- **There is no harmonization regarding training or educational activities for professionals and no common understanding of their implementation.** State or regional centres for the education of professionals could be set up with homogeneous criteria for education, methodology and assessment on animal welfare, but different levels for implementation.

- **Experts who educate professionals and implement training courses sometimes do not have the adequate background or knowledge to transmit information correctly.**
There are many wild animals living in captivity and many exotic pets all over the world, but there is a lack of scientific information and knowledge about them. The inspection of zoos and circuses is done by auditors, but they are not experts with an adequate background or sufficient knowledge.

EU training initiatives, such as Better Training for Safer Food, should be adapted to a wide range of animals to help improve knowledge and build the capacity of competent authorities.

8.1 Identification of activities at European level

A list of NGOs, universities, research institutes and other organisations, public bodies and private companies were consulted in relation to general and specific programmes on animal welfare for professionals (the complete list is shown in the appendix 12).

A summary with the main information received is detailed by country.

**Austria**

The most important activities in Austria are developed by the institution “Tierschutz macht Schule” (TmS), with the collaboration of the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences of Vienna (BOKU).

**Finland**

The Finnish Centre for Animal Welfare (EHK) elaborates material for the education and training of professionals working with animals. It has been conducting a large training programme for Finnish pig farmers concerning pig welfare. Around 1000 farmers have been trained in two-day courses.

The EESP (Eettinen Eläinkaupa Sertifioitu Liike) provides Finnish pet shops with the possibility to apply for an ethical certificate that implies a core principle of animal welfare. The aim of the certificate is to ensure good animal welfare and constant updating of staff expertise. Furthermore, certification offers clients a way to identify pet shops with a special focus on animal welfare.25

**Germany**

BSI stands for “Beratungs- und Schulungsinstitut für Tierschutz bei Transport und Schlachtung (Training and Consultancy Institute for animal welfare at transport and slaughter). It is a private veterinarian institute working on applied animal welfare in transport and slaughter that provides training, consulting and research for the industry and governmental bodies mostly in Germany, Austria, Switzerland, but also EU-wide. Overall 706 training courses/seminaries (counted up to end of 2011) have been carried out.

**Italy**

The IZSAM (Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale of Abruzzo and Molise) G. Caporale is a research institute very active in the development of materials and training courses for professionals, especially for official veterinarians under the Better Training for Safer Food (BTSF) programme of the EU.

The Istituto zooprofilattico sperimentale of Lombardia and Emilia Romagna ‘Bruno Ubertini’ is the National Animal Welfare Reference Centre devoted to basic and applied research, scientific education and training on animal welfare.26

26 [http://www.izsler.it/pls/izs_bslv3_s2aw_consultazione.mostra_pagina?id_pagina=1498](http://www.izsler.it/pls/izs_bslv3_s2aw_consultazione.mostra_pagina?id_pagina=1498)
The Association of veterinarians collaborate in the web portal ‘Veterinaria e sicurezza alimentare’. The aim of this portal is to gather and disseminate information in relation to veterinarian and food security topics, including animal welfare.

The Associations of producers supports teaching programs on animal welfare such as the “Programma di Sviluppo Ruale in Lazio or Sardegna”.

There are also a set of courses organized by competent authorities.

**Romania**

NGOs and the Romanian Veterinarian College regularly organize training events on animal welfare for professionals, such as Project Romania.

**Spain**

The Farm Animal Welfare Educational Centre (FAWEC) was created by the Animal School of Veterinary Science of the Autonomous University of Barcelona with the objective of producing educational resources on farm animal welfare and holding theoretical and practical training courses on dairy cattle and pig welfare. More information can be found on http://www.fawec.org/index-eng.php.

The Animal Welfare Subprogram of IRTA coordinates educational courses on animal welfare for pig, cattle, rabbits, small ruminants and poultry farmers, transport drivers and personnel working at slaughterhouses. From 2008, the group has conducted more than 4000 training hours for professionals working with animals. The subprogram also organizes, on demand, training for professionals on the assessment of animal welfare in pig farms and slaughterhouses based on the Welfare Quality protocols. The group has also participated in training activities funded by the European Commission (BTSF, TAIEX), national and regional governments. Other institutes and universities (such as the Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, UPM), farm organisations and private consultants also develop courses for professionals.

**Sweden**

A national educational consortium is under development stemming from the collaboration between the largest users of experimental animals (universities and the pharmaceutical industries) to comply with the legislation.

A learning resource named DISA (Djurvälfärd i samband med slakt och annan avlivning) developed by the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences (SLU) on animal welfare at slaughter, and aligned with the Regulation EC 1099/2009, is used primarily by slaughterhouse personnel but also by other interested parties. It includes about 800 pages, 700 photographs and 170 video clips.

The MENY licence in food hygiene is a basic education in food hygiene administered by the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences and offers courses for lorry drivers, slaughterhouse personnel, veterinarians and technicians. The web based course, which is equivalent to eight hours studies, is completed with an interactive final exam.

---

28 [http://www.agricoltura.regione.lazio.it/primo-piano/?page=3&id= CORSO-DI-FORMAZIONE-ALLA_30&ref=contenuto&testo](http://www.agricoltura.regione.lazio.it/primo-piano/?page=3&id= CORSO-DI-FORMAZIONE-ALLA_30&ref=contenuto&testo)
30 [http://www.ausl.mo.it/dsp/flex/cm/pages/serveBLOB.php?L=IT/Pagina/3734](http://www.ausl.mo.it/dsp/flex/cm/pages/serveBLOB.php?L=IT/Pagina/3734)
31 [http://www.saiaveneto.it/?lang=en](http://www.saiaveneto.it/?lang=en)
32 [http://disa.slu.se](http://disa.slu.se)
The Swedish Blue Star has the social mission of taking care of animals during crises, disasters, outbreaks of diseases and other issues that could affect animals. The organization offers courses for around 2300 members.\(^{34}\)

**The Netherlands**

In addition to the initiatives of the Competent Authorities and NGOs previously mentioned in page 21, Wageningen University and the University of Utrecht have developed materials on animal welfare.\(^{35}\)

**United Kingdom**

The Jeanne Marching International Centre for Animal Welfare Education (JMICAWE) is part of the University of Edinburgh’s Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies and is a hub of expertise on animal welfare education, collaborating with international partners to advance understanding of animal welfare issues.\(^{36}\)

The Born Free Foundation promotes knowledge-sharing conferences on wild animals in captivity, Global Welfare Guidance for Animals in Tourism and the SANCO/FVE animal welfare training courses for practitioners in relation to wild species.\(^{37}\)

The government provides recommendations for stockmanship. Although there are no formal requirements, most farm managers have a qualification in agriculture or a related subject, Access to the farming and breeding industry commonly involves undertaking an apprenticeship in which animal welfare management practices are included.\(^{38}\)

A key initiative regarding training is the ‘Poultry Passport’, established by an expert group made up of representatives from the largest national poultry processors and growers, Lantra (the sector skills council for the land based sector), British Poultry Council, National Farmers Union and PoultEC Training (an independent poultry training specialist and National Skills Academy Champion for Meat and Poultry). The objective is to develop a consistent level of training for each job role across the UK poultry industry with an industry wide training recording system. Having a Poultry Passport and meeting the defined minimum training standards is a requirement of the Red Tractor Chicken and Duck standards. Poultry Passports are also referred to in the Quality British Turkey scheme and is also increasingly becoming a requirement of UK supermarket retailer audits.\(^{39}\)

Freedom Food is a farm assurance scheme where members must meet animal welfare standards set by the RSPCA. It also assesses hatcheries, lorry drivers, animal handlers, slaughterhouses and processors. In addition, RSPCA farm livestock officers carry out audits.\(^{40}\)

The Scottish Rural College (SRuC), the University of Bristol and the International Fund for Animal Welfare are also important actors in the education on animal welfare.\(^{41}\)

**European Initiatives:**

**Better Training for Safer Food (BTSF)** is a Commission initiative aimed at organising a Community (EU) training strategy in the areas of food law, feed law, animal health and animal welfare rules, as well as plant health rules, with a view to:

\(^{34}\) [http://www.svenskablastjarnan.se](http://www.svenskablastjarnan.se)/
\(^{35}\) [http://www.dierenwelzijnsweb.nl/nl/dierenwelzijnsweb.htm](http://www.dierenwelzijnsweb.nl/nl/dierenwelzijnsweb.htm)
\(^{36}\) [http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/vet/jeanne-marchig-centre](http://www.ed.ac.uk/schools-departments/vet/jeanne-marchig-centre)
\(^{38}\) [https://www.gov.uk/gis-welfare-regulations](https://www.gov.uk/gis-welfare-regulations)/
\(^{39}\) [http://www.poultrypassport.org](http://www.poultrypassport.org/)
\(^{40}\) [http://www.freedomfood.co.uk](http://www.freedomfood.co.uk)
\(^{41}\) [http://www.ifaw.org](http://www.ifaw.org)
Ensuring and maintaining a high level of consumer protection and of animal health, animal welfare and plant health;
Promoting a harmonised approach to the operation of Community and national control systems;
Creating an equal level playing field for all food businesses;
Enhancing trade of safe food;
Ensuring fair trade with third countries and in particular developing countries.

Training is designed for all staff of Competent Authorities of Member States involved in official control activities so as to keep them up-to-date with all aspects of Community law in the areas specified above and ensure that controls are carried out in a uniform, objective and adequate manner in all Member States.42

TAIEX is the Technical Assistance and Information Exchange instrument managed by the Directorate-General Enlargement of the European Commission. It supports partner countries with regard to the approximation, application and enforcement of EU legislation, included animal welfare.

The Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network (EUWellNet) was a pilot project with the objective of evaluating the feasibility and usefulness of a network that could assist competent authorities and stakeholders in implementing EU legislation on animal welfare. A specific aim was to collect all the information about training in farm animal welfare that knowledge providers (universities, research and technical institutes) were performing in 16 countries of Europe. An e-learning tool for pig training was also developed.43

The AWARE project (Animal Welfare Research in an Enlarged Europe) had the objective of promoting integration and increasing the impact of European research on farm animal welfare. One of the main tasks was to elaborate and implement a database of farm animal welfare materials, including training materials for stakeholders involved in farm animal welfare issues.44

The Animal Welfare Indicators (AWIN) project addressed the development, integration and dissemination of animal-based welfare indicators with an emphasis on pain assessment and pain recognition. AWIN created the Animal Welfare Science Hub with the objective of sharing animal welfare information worldwide among stakeholders.45

Animal Concepts is a specific website dedicated to wildlife aimed at protecting the environments and well-being of these animals through active education, research, conservation and empathy. This organization collaborates with other professionals at universities, research institutes, zoos, marine parks, laboratories, wildlife sanctuaries and national parks to develop high standard animal well-being programmes.46

8.2 Current legislation on training on animal welfare in Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Spain, Sweden and UK

The aim of this task was to review the European and national legislations of the 8 countries and to identify the educational requirements in relation to animal welfare for the professional categories considered in the project (farmers, lorry drivers, slaughterhouse personnel, veterinarians, technicians, pet shop personnel, zoo personnel and personnel working with animals in the experimentation context).

Farmers: pigs and broilers

42 http://ec.europa.eu/chafea/food/about.html
43 http://www.euwellnet.eu/euwelnet
44 http://fvm.ukim.edu.mk/awre/
45 http://www.animalwelfarehub.com/Home
46 http://www.animalconcepts.eu/
On the basis of Directive 2008/120/EC for pigs and Directive 2007/43/EC for broilers, all keepers must receive sufficient training on animal welfare, including physiology, in particular drinking and feeding needs, animal behaviour and the concept of stress, the practical aspects of the careful handling of animals, emergency care, emergency killing and culling, and preventive biosecurity measures.

The EU regulation sets content and minimum requirements that these professionals have to meet, but there are no indications on the lectures/hours the courses must follow. The main differences between Member States are related to the duration of the courses and the ways these courses are implemented. No details on the compulsory courses have been identified in Greece, Poland, Romania, Sweden and the UK. In Italy, at least one employer per farm has to attend a training course, and the compulsory course lasts 8 hours, whereas in Spain the duration is of 20 hours.

To be professionally involved in farming in Lithuania, a compulsory course on animal production must be completed in order to obtain the 'Farming Knowledge Curriculum Completion Certificate'. Training on the 'Requirements for animal welfare' is included in the course.

In Poland there are no additional national requirements, but if a person inherits or decides to buy some land, then minimum qualifications on animal welfare are required.

No additional national legal requirements for the training of these professionals have been identified in Greece, Italy, Romania, Spain, Sweden or the UK.

**Lorry drivers**

Regulation EC 1/2005 contains requirements for the training of people who intend to engage in animal transportation. It establishes a series of requirements in relation to the skills and knowledge of these professionals. Road drivers and assistants as referred to in Article 6(5) and Article 17(1) must have successfully completed the training as provided for in paragraph 2, and must have passed an examination approved by the competent authority, which shall ensure that examiners are independent. The certificate of competence is issued by the competent authority or body designated for this purpose by the Member State.

The training courses must include the technical and administrative aspects of the Regulation concerning the protection of animals during transport and in particular animal physiology, but also drinking and feeding, animal behaviour and the concept of stress, practical aspects of animal handling, the impact of driving practices on the welfare of transported animals and on the quality of meat, emergency care for animals and safety considerations for personnel handling animals.

The EU regulation sets the content and minimum training requirements, but there are no indications on the lectures and duration of these courses. The main differences identified between Member States regarded the duration of courses and the ways these implemented.

No details on the training hours were identified in Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and the UK. In Lithuania the compulsory course lasts 10 hours, whereas in Spain it lasts 20 hours. In Sweden training comprises two days as well as homework assignments.

Other differences include the duration of the validity of the certificate of competence. In Greece the certificate is valid for five years; in Romania it is valid for two years while in Spain the duration is not established.

No additional national legal requirements for the training of these professionals have been identified in any of the studied countries.
Slaughterhouse personnel

According to Regulation, EC 1099/2009, slaughterhouse personnel must hold a certificate of competence provided by national authorities. To this end they must complete compulsory training courses on animal welfare. These courses must include the handling and care of animals before they are restrained, the restraint of animals for the purpose of stunning or killing, the stunning of animals, the assessment of effective stunning, the shackling or hoisting of live animals, the bleeding of live animals and the slaughtering in accordance with the Regulation.

The EU regulation sets content and minimum requirements that these professionals have to meet, but there are no indications on the lectures and duration of these courses. The main differences identified between Member States regarded the duration of the courses and the ways these are implemented.

In Lithuania, the national training programme specifies a minimum of 8 hours for theoretical training and 4 hours of practical training. In Spain, the duration of the courses must be of at least 20 hours. No details on the compulsory courses were identified in the other countries.

No additional national legal requirements for the training of these professionals have been identified in any of the studied countries.

Researchers

According to EU Directive 2010/63/EU, measures are set for the protection of animals used for scientific or educational purposes. The Directive establishes that an essential factor for the protection of animals used for scientific purposes is the competence of the personnel. Therefore, Member States must ensure that each breeder, supplier and user has sufficient staff on site. The staff must be adequately educated and trained before they perform any of the following functions: a) carrying out procedures on animals, b) designing procedures and projects, c) taking care of animals, d) killing animals.

Persons carrying out the functions referred to in point (b) must have received instruction in a scientific discipline relevant to the work being undertaken and shall have species-specific knowledge. Staff carrying out functions referred to in points (a), (c) or (d) must be supervised in the performance of their tasks until they have demonstrated the requisite competence.

Member States must publish minimum requirements with regard to education and training and the requirements for obtaining, maintaining and demonstrating requisite competence.

In addition to the EU legislation, the Commission established an Expert Working Group formed by all the Member States and main stakeholders to develop a common education and training framework for the EU to fulfil the requirements of the Directive. The EU guidance was developed to respond to the need for harmonisation and a common framework to ensure competence and to facilitate free movement of personnel. The proposed framework is based on a Modular Training structure with a focus on Learning Outcomes instead of specific contents. The learning outcome is then combined with a period working under supervision to improve knowledge, and only after being assessed as competent, trained people can continue their work without supervision. To achieve the desired outcomes of appropriate training standards and free movement of personnel, sufficiently detailed 'Learning Outcomes for the Modular Training' are required, together with an agreed understanding of assessment criteria.

Zoo personnel

Directive 1999/22/EC aims to protect wild fauna and to preserve biodiversity by inviting Member States to take measures concerning the granting of licences and carrying out regular inspections in European zoos.

However, there is no mention of the educational requirements on animal welfare for zoo personnel working with animals. No additional national requirements for the training of these professionals have been identified in any of the countries studied.

8.3 **Highlighted cases**

8.3.1 **The Farm Animal Welfare Education Centre (FAWEC)**

The information was collected by means of interviews with Dr. Xavier Manteca, Dr. Eva Mainau and Dr. Déborah Temple, members of the FAWEC located in the Autonomous University of Barcelona. The FAWEC was created at the end of 2012 by the Department of Animal and Food Science of the School of Veterinary Science at the Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB). FAWEC’s main objectives are to produce educational resources on farm animal welfare and to run theoretical and practical training courses on dairy cattle and pig welfare.

To achieve this, FAWEC:

1. Produces a set of documents on animal welfare which are available for free on-line, covering general concepts as well as more specific issues on pig and cattle welfare. These include: ‘fact sheets’, which are mainly theoretical and specifically addressed to vets and scientists working in animal science disciplines; ‘Practical notes’, specifically addressed to farmers and practicing vets and ‘Updates’, providing the latest information on animal welfare issues. The fact sheets and practical notes are mainly distributed digitally. In some cases, FAWEC distributes printed fact sheets at congresses or livestock fairs. FAWEC’s website is visited around the world and receives excellent feedback from Latin America, Spain and Poland.

2. Organizes workshops on farm animal welfare for veterinarians and other professionals with experience in animal science. Two main programs are offered: pig welfare and dairy cattle welfare. The main objectives of the workshops on the welfare of pigs and dairy cattle are:

   1. to understand the concept of animal welfare as applied to farm animals
   2. to present the content of the EU directives on farm animal welfare and discuss the expected changes in the EU legislation on animal welfare in the near future
   3. to become familiar with the main welfare problems on pig and dairy farms and
   4. to understand the basis of on-farm animal welfare assessment

The workshops include lectures, group discussions and farm visits. The workshops are run in Spanish, English or French. To date, a total of 156 people have been trained by the FAWEC (42 from Spain, 29 from Chile, 16 from France, 57 from Poland, 8 from Turkey, 2 from Argentina and 2 from Italy). Around 90% of participants were veterinary practitioners. The remaining 10% were agronomists, scientists, technicians or product managers with experience in animal science.

3. To run webinars (on-line seminars) that cover specific issues on pig and cattle welfare. FAWEC has organized three specific webinars, which are also available for free on-line: 'The future of EU legislation on farm animal welfare', 'Pain and discomfort caused by parturition in cows and sows'; 'Tail biting and the use of enrichment material: a challenge for the pig sector'. For all three live webinars, there were a total of 240 continuously connected people (and 480 intermittently connected people). The webinars received a positive response and a considerable amount of questions via e-mail. FAWEC is exploring the possibility of organizing interactive webinars. Topics included in the webinars are proposed by FAWEC and announced on their website and via e-mail.

---

48 [www.fawec.org](http://www.fawec.org)
FAWEC compiles information by attending congresses or livestock fairs, by e-mail messages received through their website, or through discussions with veterinarians and producers in different workshops or courses attended by FAWEC members. The remaining 30% of the topics included in the fact sheets and practical notes are proposed by FAWEC sponsors. Once a year, different topics are discussed in a meeting of the FAWEC coordination committee (composed by the FAWEC team and one member representing each sponsor).

8.3.2  Study of training courses on animal welfare for pig, broiler and cattle farmers and lorry drivers in Spain

The purpose of this section was to assess the impact of the training courses carried out by IRTA researchers for farmers and lorry drivers in Spain.

Since 2008, IRTA researchers have trained farmers and lorry drivers in the compulsory animal welfare courses organized by the Catalan Government for the certificate of competence. In Catalonia, these courses are addressed to farmers working with three different species: pigs, chickens/laying hens and cattle. The course for lorry drivers is addressed to drivers who transport farm animals and horses.

Courses are funded by the competent authorities and a maximum of 20 students attend each course. The courses consist of 20 hours divided in 3 parts: the first part lasts 8 hours and is common to both the farmer and lorry driver courses (general concepts on animal welfare, physiology and main problems in different species); the second part also lasts 8 hours and focuses on pigs, cattle, poultry or transported animals depending on the target of the course; the last 4 hours are dedicated to a practical exercise, the exam and to answer a questionnaire about their opinion on the quality and adequacy of the course.

Results of the opinions of 83 drivers and 104 farmers who attended the courses are discussed below.

Most participants only had a primary level of education, followed by first level professional studies (after primary school). The level of education was higher among farmers (fewer professionals with no education and with elementary school education) than among lorry drivers (Figure 11). In the lorry driver courses, 8% of participants had no education and 6% university studies. The background of the students differed considerably.
One of the questions of the survey was “whether the course had fulfilled their initial expectations”. The possible answers were: No, a little, almost, and a lot. As shown in Figure 12, the answers given were mainly within the categories almost and a lot, being higher in the courses for lorry drivers than in the courses for farmers.
To the question whether “they would like to participate in a similar course”, 90% of the farmers and a 93% of the lorry drivers agreed.

Levels of satisfaction with the course were between 3 and 4 from a scale of 0 (not satisfied) to 4 (very satisfied; Figure 13).

To the question whether “the course had changed their view on the profession in any way”, 22% of the farmers and 42% of the lorry drivers answered “yes”. However, the questionnaire does not indicate whether this change is intended positively or negatively.

When attendees were asked if “they thought that the course could improve their working life”, 69% of the farmers and 40% of the lorry drivers answered positively. Of those attendees in both categories who answered positively, 55% thought that the course could improve their working life by improving the quality of their work, 19% by obtaining more personal satisfaction, 18% by improving safety in their workplace, 17% by getting a better salary and 12% by obtaining higher stability in their workplace.
Finally, to the question whether “students would suggest to others to attend the same course”, 93% of the farmers and 90% of the lorry drivers answered positively.

The opinion of attendees on the course was not very positive over the first and following initial courses, mostly because they were compulsory and required taking time from work without receiving any kind of compensation. However, that opinion has dramatically changed and the current general opinion on the course is now positive.

When asked to explain what the best aspects of the courses were, the good relationship with the teachers and colleagues, the use of practical examples by means of videos and the focus on animal based measures were considered to be the best.

The most critical comments related to the duration of the course (some asking for more hours, others for less and others for a different distribution of the hours) and the distribution of the contents (asking for more content on specific animal species and, very rarely, on legislation).
8.3.3 Web-based resources for teaching animal welfare. Preliminary conclusions of the AWIN project

During the third annual conference of the AWIN project, held in Prague from 13th to 15th May 2014, preliminary results on the use of web-based resources for teaching animal welfare were presented. A summary of the main results and conclusions are presented below. The complete information can be found in appendix 29.

The Animal Welfare Science Hub was created by the AWIN project 49 with the objective of integrating applied and fundamental aspects in animal welfare research and creating a long-lasting relationship among stakeholders (farmers, veterinarians, university students, legislators, teachers and NGOs).

The outcomes of the research were used to provide educational materials for teachers and learners. Course organizers are able to upload their course details on the project’s website and in their own language. For non-university level teaching, the strategy was to set up partnerships between stakeholders to understand what training measures were already on offer.

Users at any level are able to search courses that are being offered worldwide. They can find online or face-to-face courses locally and internationally and filter the search by animal species, target audience, price and time requirements of the programs. Course organizers can edit the entries as courses evolve over time.

In collaboration with the International Society for Applied Ethology (ISAE), teaching programs will be evaluated by objective expert panels based on their pedagogic and scientific value according to the intended audience.

The main challenge is to promote the use of the Animal Welfare Science Hub over many others available online and to engage stakeholders in science-based online learning. Like any new online tool, it requires continuous feedback, updates and improvement to get it to work optimally. Social media such as Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn are now starting to show success in increasing the use of the hub.

49 www.animalwelfarehub.com
9. General discussion on vocational training for personnel working with animals

When professionals were asked to define animal welfare in an open question, most of them used “inputs” related concepts such as handling, caring and the environment or conditions where animals live, rather than “outcomes” terms related to the state of the animal. Regarding the level of knowledge on animal welfare, differences between the animal species and countries were found. Farmers working with pigs and broilers showed the highest values of knowledge on the matter, whereas farmers working with laying hens showed the lowest. The countries with the highest percentages of trained farmers were also those where farmers received training for longer periods of time.

Only Lithuania and Austria require previous training or qualifications to become a farmer. In Lithuania there is a national legal requirement to attend a compulsory course on the basics of farming for those wanting to work in farming. However, no obligation for the continuity of training in any of the two countries is required.

Producer associations believe courses on animal welfare should be oriented in accordance with commercial conditions, using simpler language and including aspects that could help increase productivity. They also believe farmers should receive support or some form of compensation for the time invested in the courses.

Producer associations believe that for training to be valuable, courses should be up to date, harmonized for all Member States and guarantee continuity of learning. A specific European training programme on animal welfare, in which other issues related to animal production (performance, health issues, etc.) are included, was also viewed as necessary. The programme should also focus on teacher training, use simple language, have a sound scientific basis and a defined communication and dissemination strategy. While farmers and lorry drivers are satisfied with the courses provided, there is a lack of tools to assess them and the real impact they have on animal welfare. A standard way of assessing the quality of the courses and their results is viewed as important.

Farmers were asked about how the costs of high animal welfare standards affect them, the pressure they perceive from retailers to reach higher levels of animal welfare and the tendency of consumers to pay more for welfare-friendly products. Farmers believe more information for consumers and a new approach towards farmers is needed. In Sweden, for instance, there is great demand from retailers and consumers for animal products with high welfare standards and consumers show a strong willingness to pay more for these products. However in Spain, while farmers feel strong pressure from retailers, the consumer’s willingness to pay more is low, so high standards of animal welfare are viewed as an additional cost to production. The exchange of experiences between farmers of different countries on these issues (particularly between Northern and Southern Europe) should be encouraged.

The majority of lorry drivers assessed themselves as having a level of knowledge on animal welfare above 7 (on a scale of 0 to 10). However, despite more than 85% of lorry drivers indicating they had received animal welfare training (with the exception of Spain, with only 43%), the percentage of those who were able to answer questions on the requirements of the regulation on animal welfare was very low. This might suggest that the training they received did not include legislation on animal welfare.

In the case of slaughterhouse personnel, some important differences were also found between countries regarding educational background and training. In the UK and Sweden, the majority had received training on animal welfare, whereas in Spain or Greece the percentage resulted in less than 50%. In these two countries, workers’ knowledge on animal welfare and on the current legislation applying to slaughterhouses was low. While Poland, Sweden and Lithuania had high percentages of trained personnel on animal welfare, very low percentages of lorry drivers knew about the related legislation (with values
close to 0%), indicating once again that issues concerning the legislation are not included in their training, or that legislation is not adequately explained.

Veterinarians and technicians rated their knowledge on animal welfare at an average of 7. They consider their professional experience to be their main source of information, as was the case for farmers, although the attendance to courses and background knowledge acquired during their bachelor's degree studies were also viewed as central (this last point was particularly important among younger professionals, as animal welfare is usually included as part of their studies). Most veterinarians and technicians also said they receive updated information on animal welfare, however almost 70% were not able to mention any specific legislative requirements that apply to their workplace. This could be due to the fact that they identified their main sources of information as their own professional experience as well as technical journals or specialized magazines, which commonly deal with more scientific content rather than with issues related to legislation.

Difficulties were encountered in establishing contact with farmers, veterinarians, lorry drivers and slaughterhouse personnel in the UK. NGOs in the country play a very active role in training professionals and in reporting all types of abuse. There is also strong pressure on animal welfare from the general public and retailers. Having taken these elements into consideration, an open and more transparent attitude towards the production sector was expected. Instead, there was reluctance to collaborate in the study, particularly regarding slaughterhouse personnel, including official veterinarians, who were afraid of suffering reprisals for participating in the survey. Some farmers refused to participate in the survey or were only willing to answer if there was an official requirement from DEFRA. For whatever reason, this was only experienced in the UK and in some cases with researchers and slaughterhouse personnel in Greece, though still to a lesser extent.

The educational background of researchers was found to be the highest of all the professionals interviewed, with the majority being veterinarians and PhD graduates, though they had lower results in specific animal welfare training than expected. Zoo personnel said they did not frequently attend animal welfare courses, with an average frequency of 0 or less than 1 course per year, with the exception of Greece and Lithuania, where personnel also obtained the highest values for self-assessment on animal welfare knowledge (with an average of 8 and 8.3, respectively). The percentage of pet shop personnel who indicated having received specific training was low (51%), with an average percentage of 46% indicating they had not followed any courses on animal welfare in the last five years. The best results were found in Greece, where more than 70% of pet shop personnel indicated having taken part in specific courses, of which half indicated a frequency of 1 course per year. This difference is probably due to the fact that national legislation in Greece includes some form of training requirement for this type of professional. Knowledge on animal welfare legislation among researchers, pet shop personnel and zoo personnel was low, leading to believe that legislation is not addressed in their specific training.
10. Conclusions

**General conclusions**

- The level of knowledge of the general public on animal welfare appears to be to a great extent based on expectations rather than the reality of farming systems.
- Initiatives to promote education on animal welfare, aimed at the general public, students and consumers are being carried out mainly by NGOs.
- Training initiatives aimed at professionals are more effective. While many such activities are being conducted around Europe, there remains a lack of harmonisation.

**Specific conclusions**

**For the general public, students and consumers.**

- Most considered their own level of knowledge on animal welfare to be low and information available to be scarce.
- Those who admitted to having a low level of knowledge showed a strong interest in being better informed.
- The level of knowledge on animal welfare legislation is very low in all countries and in all categories of respondents.
- Animal welfare has little presence in the media.
- Consumers do not view labelling as a credible source of information. The only obligatory labelling system is for egg codification but very few people know the meaning of the code numbers. The system has not been supported by an efficient communication strategy.

**Professionals working with animals:**

- Although it is mandatory in the EU for pig and broiler producers to take part in animal welfare training, not all farmers do. Furthermore, in countries with the highest percentages of trained farmers (Spain and the UK), there were longer time lapses since their last training course.
- The lowest percentages of farmers who have been trained in animal welfare were those working with laying hens.
- Farmers generally say that their main source of information on animal welfare comes from their own experience.
- A high percentage of farmers, lorry drivers and slaughterhouse personnel receive up to date information on animal welfare, with the exception of lorry drivers in Spain and slaughterhouse personnel in both Greece and Spain.
- Lorry drivers and slaughterhouse personnel already trained in animal welfare showed poor knowledge of EU animal welfare legislation associated with their professions.
- Differences were found between countries with regards to the percentage of professionals trained as well as the quality of information on legislation received during the training courses.
• A high percentage of veterinarians and technicians were of the opinion that they have a high level of animal welfare knowledge. However, the longer they had obtained their university degree, the more their main source of information derived from professional experience rather than specific training.

• While a high number of researchers have been trained in animal welfare, percentages differ dramatically between countries (ranging from 0% to 87%). In addition, the majority of interviewees were unable to mention any aspect of Directive 2010/63/EU regarding the protection of animals used for scientific purposes.

• Only 10% of pet shop personnel were able to mention aspects related to the Directive on animal welfare applied at their workplace. Romania and Spain, who have the largest numbers of veterinarians and veterinary assistants working in pet shops, were also the countries with highest average scores on the level of self-assessment of animal welfare knowledge of the two professions.

Stakeholders:

• The producer associations, NGOs, veterinary associations, journalists and law professors interviewed are in favour of introducing animal welfare into primary and secondary education in the Member States.

• According to producer associations and journalists specialised in animal production, there is a lack of trust between professionals and society which needs to be addressed. This can be overcome by providing adequate, accessible information.

• The same distrust is shown by NGOs regarding the role and information provided by private companies. In their opinion an independent body is needed to remedy this issue.

• Associations and stakeholders from the production sector recognize that education and information on animal welfare is mainly provided by NGOs, although they believe their information campaigns are not sufficiently objective.

• The same group believes that tools such as guidelines, handbooks, games, participation of guest speakers at schools in workshops on animal production could improve public knowledge on animal welfare.

• Increased resources for teacher training initiatives across Europe would help to improve animal welfare knowledge.

• Farmers are mostly willing to take part in training activities if they see them as a way of improving the economic performance of their farms. The main obstacles for not attending courses vary from lack of help on the farm while the farmer is away, lack of financial support or even the irrelevance of the course to individual farmers’ needs.

• It would be of benefit if farmers from different countries were encouraged to exchange best practices.

• NGOs and producer associations state that animal welfare issues are, on some occasions, addressed by people without sufficient qualifications who are therefore unable to transfer knowledge adequately, leading to misinterpretation or misunderstanding.

• Most stakeholders stressed that there is no harmonization in training activities for professionals and no common understanding of training implementation on the farm.

• Pig and broiler farmers, lorry drivers, slaughterhouse personnel and researchers are legally required by the EU to undertake animal welfare training. Assessing the validity and efficiency of
certifications awarded at the end of training would help to improve the levels of knowledge on animal welfare.

- The training of professionals is driven by research institutes, universities and competent authorities. However, there is a lack of harmonisation and information on training assessment criteria.

- There are different types of initiatives targeted at professionals in the EU, such as the FVE and FAWEC courses for veterinary practitioners, BTSF for official veterinarians, RSPCA courses for farmers and BFF courses for zookeepers.

Case study: Austria

- Education on the welfare of pets and farm animals is formally integrated into the Austrian school curricula for students between 10 and 14 years old. However, the specific content and approach is not harmonised on a national level, depending instead on criteria defined by individual teachers. In other countries, the teaching of animal welfare depends entirely on the initiative of the teacher.

- In Austria, "Tierschutz macht Schule" – an association for animal welfare education, has developed courses for teachers with a peer to peer training system. Educational materials, created with the help of experts, are provided to schools and teachers free of charge. This innovative approach could also be a model for other EU countries.
Appendix 1: Questionnaire from secondary school students

Date: ___________________ Query(S)____________________

   ___________________________________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________
   ___________________________________________________________________________________________

2. How much informed do you think you are about animal welfare? (circle the number selected).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-informed</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. In general terms, what do you think is the level of animal welfare in your country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. From the following list of species, how much do you worry about their welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0: I’m not worried</td>
<td>5: Indifferent</td>
<td>10: I’m very worried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Laying hens
- Milk cows
- Beef for meat
- Goats for meat
- Broilers for meat
- Rabbits for meat
- Pigs for meat
- Sheep for milk/meat
- Laboratory animals (mice and others)
- Others

5. You think that the information you receive about animal welfare is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. From which sources do you usually get/obtain information in relation to animal welfare?:

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

7. Do you think that the rules to improve animal welfare must be more restrictive in your country?

☑ Yes, for sure ☐ Yes, probably
☐ No, probably no ☐ No, for sure
☐ I don’t know

8. Which of the following aspects do you think are regulated by Animal welfare legislation?

8.1. Space allowance per animal in relation to the weight

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I don’t know

8.2. Age and method of the castration of animals

☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ I don’t know
8.3. The obligation to have background music in farmyards
   □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.4. The obligation to limit the groups of animals to 4 individuals
   □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.5. The limitation to use cages and ties in animals
   □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.6. The obligation for certain species to use straw as bedding material or environmental enrichment material
   □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.7. The animals that are suitable or not to be transported
   □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.8. The obligation to have available water for animals that are transported, whatever the duration of the transport
   □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.9. The obligation to stun animals before slaughtering
   □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.10. The obligation to feed animals after certain hours at the slaughterhouse
      □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.11. The obligation that animals have a space for resting before slaughtering
       □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.12. The obligation to use showers in cases of heat stress
       □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

8.13. The number of animals per drinking troughs in the pen
       □ Yes □ No □ I don’t know

9. The eggs we eat are codified with letters and numbers, like:

   If you know the meaning, please indicate the code of the following categories:
   Caged production system
   Barn Production system
   Free range production system
   Organic production system
   I don’t know
   I don’t remember

10. Have you ever lived in a rural area for periods longer than 15 days?
    □ Yes □ No

11. Have you ever visited a farm?
    □ Yes □ No

12. How would you define the experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. Do you think that castrating pets is a problem of animal welfare?
    □ Yes □ No

14. Do you think that castrating animals for meat production is a problem for animal welfare?
    □ Yes □ No

15. What is your level of agreement to the following statements?

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0: Absolutely disagree | 5: Indifferent | 10: Totally agree |

Should the subject of animal welfare be taught in your courses?

Do you agree that animals are used for work?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree using animals for entertainment or sports?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree keeping animals for the production of food or fur?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree killing animals when they are seriously injured or ill?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree observing animal behaviour in an experiment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that medical experiments use animals to improve human health?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree testing cosmetics or household products on animals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree increasing animals’ health or disease resistance by genetic changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree castrating pigs for production?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree controlling animal populations by sterilization?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree inflicting pain or injury on animals as part of cultural traditions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Residence:.................

17. Year of birth:...........

18. Gender:  ☐ Male    ☐ Female
Appendix 2: Questionnaire from graduate students

Date: ___________________ Query(F)_________________


(FROM QUESTION 1 → EVALUATION OF THE INTERVIEWER)

The interviewed shows/...mentions the word.../makes reference to:;

- Suffering
- Emotions
- Happiness
- Stress
- Natural/outdoor conditions
- Housing/clean environment/healthy
- Behaviour
- Health/medical treatments
- Feeding/concentrate
- Others:

2. How much informed do you think you are about animal welfare? (circle the number selected).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-informed</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. In general terms, what do you think is the level of animal welfare in your country:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. From the following list of species, how much do you worry about their welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0: I’m not worried</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laying hens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk cows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef cattle for meat production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats for meat/milk production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broilers for meat production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits for meat production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs for meat production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep for milk/meat production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory animals (i.e. mice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Would you like to be more informed about the production systems of animal products that you normally consume?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0: No, I’m not interested</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. From which sources do you normally receive the information related to animal welfare?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________
7. What is for you the credibility of these sources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News from TV and radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spots from TV and radio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific programs/ radio or TV documentaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist newspapers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized magazines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informative brochures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School formation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits to farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Label of the products</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication campaigns of private companies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalist websites in internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized websites in internet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you think that the rules to improve animal welfare must be more restrictive in your country?
   - Yes, for sure
   - Yes, probably
   - No, probably
   - No, for sure
   - I don't know

9. Which of the followings aspects do you think are regulated by Animal welfare legislation?

   a) Space allowance per animal in relation to the weight
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   b) Age and method of the castration of animals
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   c) The obligation to have background music in farmyards
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   d) The obligation to limit the groups of animals to 4 individuals
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   e) The limitation to use cages and ties in animals
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   f) The obligation for certain species to use straw as bedding material or environmental enrichment material
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   g) The animals that are suitable or not to be transported
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   h) The obligation to have available water for animals that are transported, whatever the duration of the transport
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   i) The obligation to stun animals before slaughtering
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   j) The obligation to feed animals after certain hours at the slaughterhouse
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   k) The obligation that animals have a space for resting before slaughtering
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   l) The obligation to use showers in cases of heat stress
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know

   m) The number of animals per drinking troughs in the pen
      i. Yes
      i. No
      i. I don't know
10. The eggs we eat are codified with letters and numbers, like:

If you know the meaning, please indicate the code of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caged production system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Production system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free range production system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic production system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t remember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Have you ever lived in a rural area for periods longer than 15 days?
   - Yes
   - No

12. Have you ever visited a farm?
   - Yes
   - No

13. How would you define the experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Very positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Very negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What is your level of agreement to the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Absolutely agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Absolutely disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Do you agree that animals are used for work? [ ]
- Do you agree using animals for entertainment or sports? [ ]
- Do you agree rearing animals for the production of food? [ ]
- Do you agree rearing animals for fur production? [ ]
- Do you agree killing animals when they are seriously injured or ill? [ ]
- Do you agree observing animal behaviour in an experiment? [ ]
- Do you agree that medical experiments use animals to improve human health? [ ]
- Do you agree testing cosmetics or household products on animals? [ ]
- Do you agree increasing animals’ health or disease resistance by genetic changes? [ ]
- Do you agree Inflicting pain or injury on animals as part of cultural traditions? [ ]

15. Residence: ..........................................

16. Year of birth: ...........

17. Gender:  
   - Male  
   - Female

18. Employment situation: ........................................
Appendix 3: Questionnaire from consumers

Date: ___________________ Query(C)____________________

1. Are you responsible for doing the food shopping at home?  
   □ Yes   □ No

2. Are you a meat consumer?  □ Yes  □ No

3. Are you an eggs/milk consumer?  □ Yes  □ No

4. What kind of animal products do you eat and how many times per month?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of meat</th>
<th>Times per month</th>
<th>Type or product</th>
<th>Times per month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pig</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Beef</td>
<td>Milk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamb</td>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>Chicken</td>
<td>Fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>Ham</td>
<td>Others</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What level of importance do you give to the next aspects when you buy meat/eggs/milk)? (Circle the number selected).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Brands</th>
<th>Retailers brand</th>
<th>Animal Welfare</th>
<th>Package type</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Shelf life date</th>
<th>Fat content</th>
<th>salt content</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Nutritional information</th>
<th>Organic production</th>
<th>Others:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0: No important</td>
<td>5: Indifferent</td>
<td>10: Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0: No important</td>
<td>5: Indifferent</td>
<td>10: Very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

(FROM QUESTION 6 → FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVIEWER)  
The interviewed shows.../seems.../mentions the term.../makes reference to...;

___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffering</th>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Happiness</th>
<th>Stress</th>
<th>Natural/outdoor conditions</th>
<th>Housing/clean environment/healthy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
7. In your opinion, how much informed are you about animal welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-informed</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. In general terms, you think that the level of animal welfare in your country is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. From the following list of species, how much do you worry about their welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0: I'm not worried</td>
<td>5: Indifferent</td>
<td>10: I'm very worried</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laying hens</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milk cows</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beef for meat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goats for milk/meat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broilers for meat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rabbits for meat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pigs for meat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sheep for milk/meat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laboratory animals (mice and others)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. You think that the information you receive about animal welfare is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

11. Would you like to be more informed about the production systems of animal products that you normally consume?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0: No, I'm not interested</td>
<td>5: Indifferent</td>
<td>10: Yes, for me is very important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. From which sources do you normally receive the information related to animal welfare?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________________________

13. On your own criterium, what's the credibility of these information sources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0: Absolutely disagree</td>
<td>5: Indifferent</td>
<td>10: Totally agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>News from TV and radio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spots from TV and radio</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specific programs/ radio or TV documentaries</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Generalist newspapers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Specialized magazines</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Books</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informative brochures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative sessions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School formation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visits to farms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Label on the products</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Do you think that the rules to improve animal welfare must be more restrictive in your country?
   ☐ Yes, for sure  ☐ Yes, probably
   ☐ No, probably no  ☐ No, for sure
   ☐ I don’t know

15. Which of the followings aspects do you think are regulated by Animal welfare legislation?

8.14. Space allowance per animal in relation to the weight
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.15. Age and method of the castration of animals
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.16. The obligation to have background music in farmyards
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.17. The obligation to limit the groups of animals to 4 individuals
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.18. The limitation to use cages and ties in animals
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.19. The obligation for certain species to use straw as bedding material or environmental enrichment material
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.20. The animals that are suitable or not to be transported
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.21. The obligation to have available water for animals that are transported, whatever the duration of the transport
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.22. The obligation to stun animals before slaughtering
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.23. The obligation to feed animals after certain hours at the slaughterhouse
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.24. The obligation that animals have a space for resting before slaughtering
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.25. The obligation to use showers in cases of heat stress
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

8.26. The number of animals per drinking troughs in the pen
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

16. The eggs we eat are codified with letters and numbers and letters as shown below:

If you know the meaning, please indicate the code of the following categories:

- Caged production system
- Barn production system
- Free range production system
- Organic production system
- I don’t know
- I don’t remember
17. Have you ever lived in a rural area for periods longer than 15 days?
   □ Yes □ No

18. Have you ever visited a farm?
   □ Yes □ No

19. How would you define the experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

20. What is your level of agreement to the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0: Absolutely disagree</td>
<td>5: Indifferent</td>
<td>10: Totally agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Do you agree that animals are used for work?
- Do you agree with using animals for entertainment or sports?
- Do you agree with keeping animals for the production of food?
- Do you agree with rearing animals for the production of fur?
- Do you agree with killing animals when they are seriously injured or ill?
- Do you agree with observing animal behavior in an experiment?
- Do you agree that medical experiments use animals to improve human health?
- Do you agree with testing cosmetics or household products on animals?
- Do you agree increasing animals’ health or disease resistance by genetic changes?
- Do you agree with inflicting pain or injury on animals as part of cultural traditions?

21. Residence: ....................

22. Year of birth: .........

23. Gender: □ Male □ Female

24. Employment situation: .................................
Appendix 4: Questionnaire from general public


_______________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

(FROM QUESTION 6 ➔ FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVIEWER) The interviewed shows.../seems.../mentions the term.../makes reference to...;

Suffering
Emotions
Happiness
Stress
Natural/outdoor conditions
Housing/clean environment/healthy
Behaviour
Health/medical treatments
Feeding/concentrate
Others:

2. In your opinion, how much informed are you about animal welfare? (circle the number selected).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-informed</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very informed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3. In general terms, you think that the level of animal welfare in your country is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. From the following list of species, how much do you worry about their welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0: I'm not worried</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10: I'm very worried</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Laying hens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk cows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef for meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goats for milk/meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broilers for meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits for meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs for meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep for milk/meat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory animals (mice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. You think that the information you receive related to animal welfare is;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. From which sources do you usually get/receive information in relation to animal welfare?

_______________________________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

7. What is for you the credibility of these sources?
8. Do you think that the rules to improve animal welfare must be more restrictive in your country?

☐ Yes, for sure  ☐ Yes, probably  ☐ No, probably no  ☐ No, for sure  ☐ I don’t know

9. Which of the following aspects do you think are regulated by Animal welfare legislation?

9.1 Space allowance per animal in relation to the weight

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.2 Age and method of the castration of animals

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.3 The obligation to have background music in farmyards

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.4 The obligation to limit the groups of animals to 4 individuals

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.5 The limitation to use cages and ties in animals

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.6 The obligation for certain species to use straw as bedding material or environmental enrichment material

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.7 The animals that are suitable or not to be transported

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.8 The obligation to have available water for animals that are transported, whatever the duration of the transport

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.9 The obligation to stun animals before slaughtering

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.10 The obligation to feed animals after certain hours at the slaughterhouse

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.11 The obligation that animals have a space for resting before slaughtering

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.12 The obligation to use showers in cases of heat stress

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

9.13 The number of animals per drinking troughs in the pen

☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don’t know

10. The eggs we eat are codified with letters and numbers, like:
If you know the meaning, please indicate the code of the following categories:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caged production system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barn Production system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free range production system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic production system</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t remember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Have you ever lived in a rural area for periods longer than 15 days?
   - Yes
   - No

12. Have you ever visited a farm?
   - Yes
   - No

13. How would you define the experience?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Very negative</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What is your level of agreement to the following statements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that animals are used for work?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree using animals for entertainment or sports?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree rearing animals for the production of food?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree rearing animals for fur production?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree killing animals when they are seriously injured or ill?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree observing animal behaviour in an experiment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree that medical experiments use animals to improve human health?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree testing cosmetics or household products on animals?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree increasing animals’ health or disease resistance by genetic changes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you agree Inflicting pain or injury on animals as part of cultural traditions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Residence:........................

16. Year of birth:....................

17. Gender:   - Male   - Female

18. Employment situation: ...........................................
Appendix 5: Questionnaire from farmers

Date: ___________ Query (F) ___________

1. Type of farm ___________________ (Please indicate the type of animals that are raised in the farm; pigs, poultry, cattle, etc.)

2. Which of these daily tasks does your job include?

   2.1 Feeding the animals
   2.2 Filling the troughs
   2.3 Checking the animals (at least) once a day
   2.4 Identifying and treating animals that are not well
   2.5 Maintaining/ cleaning the areas destined for the livestock
   2.6 Isolating and taking care of the animals that are ill or injured
   2.7 Dealing with issues not related with the animals
   2.8 Dealing with issues related to reproduction
   2.9 Others (please specify)

3. What’s your academic background?

   3.1. No formal education
   3.2. Basic compulsory education
   3.3. Bachelor’s degree in agricultural science
   3.4. Post-graduate qualification in agricultural science
   3.5. Veterinary assistant / nurse
   3.6. Veterinarian
   3.7. Others (please specify)

___________________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

5. (FROM QUESTION 4 → FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVIEWER) The interviewer shows.../seems.../mentions the term.../makes reference to...;

   Suffering
   Emotions
   Happiness
   Stress
   Natural/outdoor conditions
   Housing/clean environment/healthy
   Behaviour
   Health/medical treatments
   Feeding/concentrates
   Others:

6. In your opinion, what’s your level of knowledge in animal welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Have you ever been trained in animal welfare?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No (Go to 9)

62
EDUCAWEL
FINAL REPORT

8. When was the last time you received training on animal welfare (whether technical or legislative)? ________________ months ago

9. How many training sessions or courses on animal welfare have you received in the last 5 years?
   □ Less than 5  □ More than 5
   □ More than 10  □ None

10. You have acquired your knowledge on animal welfare through:
    2.1 Specific training in animal welfare
    2.2 As part of a general training in livestock
    2.3 Specific TV programs/ documentaries
    2.4 Courses / Workshops/ Seminars
    2.5 Trade fairs / Markets /Conferences
    2.6 General manager of the farm / other colleagues
    2.7 Professional experience
    2.8 Family tradition
    2.9 Others

11. Do you normally receive updated information on animal welfare? □ Yes  □ No (Move then to question 13)

12. How do you receive this information? (Please cross with an X)
    12.1 News from TV and radio
    12.2 Adverts from TV and radio
    12.3 Specific programs/ radio or TV documentaries
    12.4 General press
    12.5 Specialised magazines
    12.6 Books
    12.7 Professional experience
    12.8 Conferences/ Workshops/ Seminars
    12.9 Trade Fairs/ Exhibitions
    12.10 Information campaigns
    12.11 Awareness campaigns
    12.12 Specialized websites on the internet
    12.13 General manager of the farm / other colleagues
    12.14 Others

13. Do you know whether information or training initiatives for farm professionals are carried out/offered in your region? □ Yes  □ No

14. Please indicate any of these initiatives related to animal welfare in which you have participated in the last year:
___________________________________________________________________________________________

15. Please rate the following statements according to your level of agreement or disagreement:

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   0: Absolutely disagree  5: Indifferent  10: Totally agree

   Higher welfare production is properly rewarded by the market
   The cost implications of improving animal welfare on farm is high
   Price premiums for high welfare products in comparison with production costs are not acceptable
   Consumers are demanding improved farm animal welfare
   Consumers are willing to pay a higher price for higher welfare products
   Food retailers require higher welfare standards
16. Place of residence: …………………

17. Year of birth: ………………………

18. Gender:  ☐ Male  ☐ Female
Appendix 6: Questionnaire from transporters

Date: __________________ Query (Tr) __________________

1. What kind of animals do you normally transport?

(Please indicate all types/species of animals you normally transport; pigs, broilers, cows, etc.).

2. What's the dimension and features (i.e. water dispenser, refrigeration system) of your truck?

3. How many travels do you do per week? (please indicate also the duration, long (>8h)/short (<8h) transport)

4. How many international transports have you done in the last year?
- Less than 5
- More than 5
- More than 50
- None

5. Which of these daily tasks does your job include?

5.1. Receiving the animals and checking the documentation

5.2. Being responsible for animal management (i.e. lairage and unloading)

5.3. Checking the status of the animals

5.4. Putting down ill or injured animals before or after the transport

5.5. Maintaining/cleaning the truck

5.6. Driving the truck

5.7. Dealing with issues not related with the animals

5.8. Being responsible for the travel (i.e. plan route and stops)

5.9. Others (please specify)

6. What's your academic background?

6.1. Without formal education

6.2. Basic compulsory education

6.3. Bachelor's degree

6.4. Upper degree

6.5. Veterinary assistant

6.6. Veterinary

6.7. Certificate of competences (for transport)

6.8. Others (please specify)


(FROM QUESTION 7 ➔ FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVIEWER) The interviewed shows.../seems.../mentions the term.../makes reference to...;

7.1. Suffering

7.2. Emotions

7.3. Happiness

7.4. Stress

7.5. Natural/outdoor conditions

7.6. Housing/clean environment/healthy
8. In your opinion, what's your level of knowledge in animal welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>High Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Have you ever been trained in animal welfare?
   ☐ Yes ☐ No (Go to 11)

10. When was the last time you received training on animal welfare (whether technical or legislative)?
    ____________ months ago

11. How many trainings or courses on animal welfare have you received in the last 5 years?
    ☐ Less than 5 ☐ More than 5 ☐ More than 10 ☐ None

12. You have acquired your knowledge on animal welfare through:
    12.1. Specific training in animal welfare
    12.2. As part of a general training in livestock
    12.3. As part of other courses
    12.4. Specific TV programmes / documentaries
    12.5. Courses / Seminars/ Conferences
    12.6. Professional experience
    12.7. Others (please specify)

13. Have you ever received specific training on animal welfare related to transport?
    ☐ Yes ☐ No

14. Do you normally receive updated information on animal welfare?
    ☐ Yes ☐ No (Go to 16)

15. This information you receive it via: *(Please cross with an X)*
    15.1. News from TV and radio
    15.2. Specific programs/ radio or TV documentaries
    15.3. Books
    15.4. Specialized magazines
    15.5. Generic websites
    15.6. Informative brochures
    15.7. Conferences/Seminars
    15.8. Regional Government
    15.9. Courses/Fairs
    15.10.Informative campaigns
    15.11.Awareness campaigns
    15.12.Specialized websites in internet
    15.13.Manager of the company / other colleagues
    15.14.Others (please specify)

16. Do you know whether informative or training initiatives for the transport professionals are carried out/offered in your region?
    ☐ Yes ☐ No

17. Please indicate any of these initiatives related to animal welfare in which you have participated in the last year:
    ____________________________________________

18. Do you know what does the legislation CE 1/2005 say about the welfare of live animals during transport and correlated operations?
    ☐ Yes ☐ No (Go to 20)
19. Could you indicate any of the requirements of this Directive?

_____________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________

20. Place of residence:..............................

21. Year of birth:.................................

22. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female
Appendix 7: Questionnaire from slaughterhouse personnel

Date: _______________  Query (SH)________________

1. Type of slaughterhouse ____________________________ *(Please indicate the type of animals that are slaughtered: pigs, broilers, cows, etc.)*

2. What’s the dimension of the place? Approximately, how many animals are slaughtered per day?

3. Which of these daily tasks does your job include?
   3.1. Receiving the animals and checking the documentation
   3.2. Feeding the animals
   3.3. Filling the troughs
   3.4. Being responsible for the managing
   3.5. Checking the status of the animals
   3.6. Putting down ill or injured animals
   3.7. Maintaining/cleaning the facilities
   3.8. Being responsible for the stunning
   3.9. Dealing with issues unrelated to animals
   3.10. Being responsible for the slaughtering
   3.11. Dealing with issues related to reproduction
   3.12. Others *(please specify)*

4. What’s your academic background?
   6.9. Without formal education
   6.10. Basic compulsory education
   6.11. Bachelor’s degree
   6.12. Upper degree
   6.13. Veterinary assistant
   6.14. Veterinary
   6.15. Certificate of competences (for slaughtering)
   6.16. Others *(please specify)*

5. What do you think Animal Welfare means? (Open question):

   *(FROM QUESTION 5 ➔ FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVIEWER)*  The interviewed shows.../seems.../mentions the term.../makes reference to...:
   5.1. Suffering
   5.2. Emotions
   5.3. Happiness
   5.4. Stress
   5.5. Natural/outdoor conditions
   5.6. Housing/clean environment/healthy
6. What's your level of knowledge in animal welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Knowledge</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>High Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Have you ever been trained in animal welfare?
☐ Yes  ☐ No (Go to 9)

8. When was the last time you received training on animal welfare (whether technical or legislative)?

___________________ months ago

9. How many trainings or courses on animal welfare have you received in the last 5 years?
☐ Less than 5  ☐ More than 5
☐ More than 10  ☐ None

10. You have acquired your knowledge on animal welfare through:

☐ 2.10 Specific training in animal welfare
☐ 2.11 As part of a general training in livestock
☐ 2.12 Specific TV programs/ documentaries
☐ 2.13 Courses / Workshops / Seminars
☐ 2.14 Trade fairs / Markets / Conferences
☐ 2.15 General manager of the farm / other colleagues
☐ 2.16 Professional experience
☐ 2.17 Family tradition
☐ 2.18 Others (please specify)

11. Are you aware of specific training related to animal welfare in religious slaughter?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

12. Have you ever received specific training on animal welfare for religious slaughter?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

13. Do you normally receive updated information on animal welfare?
☐ Yes  ☐ No (Go to 15)

14. This information you receive it via: (Please cross with an X)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12.15. News from TV and radio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.16. Specific programs/ radio or TV documentaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.17. General press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.18. Specialized magazines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.20. Professional experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.21. Conferences / Workshops / Seminars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.22. Trade fairs / Exhibitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.23. Information campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.24. Awareness campaigns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.25. Specialized websites on the internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.26. From the manager / other colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.27. Others (please specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. Do you know whether informative or training initiatives for the professionals in slaughterhouses are performed in your region?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

16. Please indicate any of these initiatives related to animal welfare in which you have participated in the last year:

___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

17. Do you know what does the legislation CE 1099/2009 say about animal welfare training for the staff in slaughterhouses?

☐ Yes  ☐ No (Go to 19)

18. Could you indicate any of the requirements of this Directive?

___________________________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________________________

19. Place of residence:....................

20. Year of birth:.........................

21. Gender:  ☐ Male  ☐ Female
Appendix 8: Questionnaire from veterinarians and engineers/technicians

**1.** Where do you work? *(Farm, kennels, zoo, clinic...)*

*(If you normally work in more than one place, please indicate that in which you spend more time)*

**2.** What type of animals do you work with?

*(Number them in order from the most to the least frequent)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Animal Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Pigs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Cows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Broilers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Exotic animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Cats and dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>Sheep/ Goats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Others <em>(please specify)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.** When did you finish your degree?

______________________________

**4.** How many years have you worked in your current professional sector/field?

_____________________________________________________

**5.** What do you think animal welfare means? *(In your own words)*

___________________________________________________________________________________________

**6.** In your opinion, what’s your level of knowledge in animal welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Knowledge</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>High Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**7.** Have you ever received specific training on animal welfare for your current position?

- [ ] Yes
- [x] No *(go to 9)*

**8.** When was the last time you received training on animal welfare (whether technical or legislative)?

______________________________

months ago

**9.** How would you define the level of animal welfare in your working place?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Animal Welfare</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**10.** How many trainings or courses on animal welfare have you received in the last 5 years?

- [ ] Less than 5
- [ ] More than 5
- [ ] More than 10
- [x] None

**11.** You would say you have acquired your knowledge on animal welfare through:

- [ ] 11.1. Specific training in animal welfare
- [ ] 11.2. As part of a general training in livestock
- [ ] 11.3. Specific TV programs / documentaries
- [ ] 11.4. Courses / Workshops / Seminars

---

**Date:** __________________

**Query (V):** ________________
12. Do you normally receive updated information on animal welfare?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

13. Please indicate how you get this information:  *(Please cross with an X)*

- 13.1. News on TV and radio
- 13.2. Adverts on TV and radio
- 13.3. Specific programs/ radio or TV documentaries
- 13.4. General press
- 13.5. Specialized magazines
- 13.6. Books
- 13.7. Professional experience
- 13.8. Conferences/ Workshops/ Seminars
- 13.9. Fairs/ Exhibitions
- 13.10. Informative campaigns
- 13.11. Awareness campaigns
- 13.13. Others

14. Do you know whether animal welfare informative or training initiatives for professionals are performed in your region?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

15. Please indicate any of these initiatives related to animal welfare in which you have participated in the last year:

________________________________________________________________________

16. In general terms, how much informed do you think the citizens of your country are about animal welfare issues?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insufficient</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Sufficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

17. Please indicate three aspects related to animal welfare in which you think the legislation of your country would need to be more strict:

a) ____________________________________________  
b) ____________________________________________  
c) ____________________________________________

18. Do you know the Directive that regulates animal welfare in your working place?  
☐ Yes  ☐ No

19. Could you mention some of the requirements indicated in this Directive?

________________________________________________________________________

20. Place of residence: ___________________________

21. Year of birth: ___________________________

22. Gender:  ☐ Male  ☐ Female
Appendix 9: Questionnaire from research personnel

Date: __________________ Query (R)__________________

1. Please indicate the type of research that is implemented here (medical, nutritional, genetic, etc)_________________________________________________

2. Indicate the type of species you normally work with:

   2.1 Fish ...................................................................................................................................................
   2.2 Amphibian ...........................................................................................................................................
   2.3 Birds ...................................................................................................................................................
   2.4 Reptils ..................................................................................................................................................
   2.5 Rodents ............................................................................................................................................... 
   2.6 Pigs ....................................................................................................................................................
   2.7 Primates ...........................................................................................................................................
   2.8 Other mammals ................................................................................................................................

3. Indicate the type of investigation and type of institution (public or private)_________________________________________________

   Your daily functions in here consist of: (cross with an X)

   Receiving the animals and checking the documentation 
   Feeding and watering the animals
   Checking the state of the animals 
   Putting down ill or injured animals
   Putting down the animals after experimentation
   Cleaning and maintaining the facilities
   Issues unrelated to animals 
   Scientific communicator (magazines, website, etc)
   Other

4. What is your education? (cross with an X)

   5.1 Bachelor's degree in Science 
   5.2 Specific degree on Animal nutrition
   5.3 Education in animal nutrition 
   5.4 Lab technician
   5.5 Researcher (without PhD)
   5.6 Technician veterinary assistant
   5.7 Doc/ Post-doc
   5.8 Veterinary
   5.9 Nurse
   5.10 Other

5. What do you think Animal Welfare means? (Open question):

   __________________________________________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________________________________________

6. (FROM QUESTION 6 FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVIEWER). The interviewed shows/seems/mentions the term/makes reference to…;(cross with an X)
7.1 Suffering
7.2 Emotions
7.3 Happiness
7.4 Stress
7.5 Natural conditions/ Freedom
7.6 Clean surrounding/ healthy
7.7 Behaviour
7.8 Vet-Medical care
7.9 Nutrition/Food
7.10 Other:

7. In your opinion, what’s your level of knowledge in animal welfare?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Knowledge</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>High Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Have you ever been trained in animal welfare?
☐ Yes  ☐ No (go to 12)

9. When was the last time you received training on animal welfare (whether technical or legislative)?

10. How many trainings or courses on animal welfare have you received in the last 5 years?
☐ Less than 5  ☐ More than 5
☐ More than 10  ☐ None

11. You have acquired your knowledge on animal welfare through: (cross with an X)

12.1 Specific training on animal welfare
12.2 As part of other educational degree
12.3 Specific TV programmes / documentaries
12.4 As part of other regulated or unregulated courses
12.5 Conferences/Seminars/Workshop
12.6 Professional experience
12.7 From the colleagues
12.8 Other

12. Do you normally receive updated information on animal welfare?
☐ No, never (Go to 15)  ☐ Yes, sometimes
☐ Yes, less than 6 times/year  ☐ Yes, more than 6 times/year

13. This information you receive it via: (cross with an X)

14.1 News from TV and radio
14.2 Spots from TV and radio
14.3 Specific programs/ radio or TV documentaries
14.4 Informative Brochures
14.5 Generic websites
14.6 Books/ Specialized magazines
14.7 Courses /seminars
14.8 Conferences
14.9 Regional Government
14.10 Informative campaigns
14.11 Awareness campaigns
14.12 Specialized websites in internet
14.13 Others

14. Please number the following issues in accordance to the relevance they have for you: (cross with an X)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0: Absolutely disagree</td>
<td>5: Indifferent</td>
<td>10: Totally agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15.1 Do you agree that animals are used for work?
15. Do you know whether informative or educational activities related to animal welfare are performed/offered in your region?
☐ Yes ☐ No

16. Please indicate any of these initiatives related to animal welfare in which you have participated in the last year:

___________________________________________________________________________________________

17. Do you know the Directive 2010/63/CE for the protection of animals used for scientific purposes?
☐ Yes ☐ No

18. Could you indicate any requirements of this Directive?

___________________________________________________________________________________________

19. Place of residence: ......................

20. Year of birth: ......................

21. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female
Appendix 10: Questionnaire from pet shop personnel

Date: __________________        Query (Ps)________________

1. Specify the species you commercialize /sell:
   1.1. Dogs
   1.2. Fish
   1.3. Cats
   1.4. Amphibians
   1.5. Birds
   1.6. Exotic animals
   1.7. Rodents
   1.8. Other

2. Your functions here consist of:
   2.1. Receiving the animals and reviewing the documentation
   2.2. Feeding and watering the animals
   2.3. Checking the conditions of the animals
   2.4. Putting down ill or injured animals
   2.5. Cleaning and maintaining the facilities
   2.6. Issues unrelated to animals
   2.7. Other

3. What is your education?
   3.1. Without formal education
   3.2. Secondary high education
   3.3. High education in Science
   3.4. Other high education
   3.5. Technician veterinary assistant
   3.6. Veterinary
   3.7. Professional education
   3.8. Other


   (FROM QUESTION 4 → FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVIEWER) The interviewed shows.../seems.../mentions the term.../makes reference to...:
   4.1. Suffering
   4.2. Emotions
   4.3. Happiness
   4.4. Stress
   4.5. Natural conditions/Freedom
   4.6. Clean surroundings/healthy
   4.7. Behaviour
   4.8. Vet-Medical care
   4.9. Nutrition/Food
   4.10. Other

5. In your opinion, what’s your level of knowledge in animal welfare?
6. Have you ever been trained in animal welfare?
   ☐ Yes  ☐ No (Go to 9)

7. When was the last time you received training on animal welfare (whether technical or legislative)?
   [ ] months ago

8. How many trainings or courses on animal welfare have you received in the last 5 years?
   ☐ Less than 5  ☐ More than 5  ☐ More than 10  ☐ None

9. How did you get your knowledge of animal welfare?
   9.1. Specific training on animal welfare
   9.2. Part of the general education
   9.3. Television programs/documentaries
   9.4. As topic of other regulated or unregulated courses
   9.5. Conference/Seminars/Workshop
   9.6. Professional experience
   9.7. Other:

10. Do you normally receive updated information on animal welfare?
    ☐ Yes  ☐ No (Go to 12)

11. This information you receive it via: *(Please cross with an X)*
    11.1. News from TV and radio
    11.2. Spots from TV and radio
    11.3. Specific programs/radio or TV documentaries
    11.4. Generalist newspapers
    11.5. Specialized magazines
    11.6. Books
    11.7. Professional experience/colleagues
    11.8. Conferences/Workshop/Seminars
    11.9. Fairs/Exhibitions
    11.10. Informative campaigns
    11.11. Awareness campaigns
    11.12. Specialized websites in internet
    11.13. Others

12. Do you know whether informative or training initiatives related to animal welfare are performed/offered in your region?
    ☐ Yes  ☐ No

13. Please indicate any of these initiatives related to animal welfare in which you have participated in the last year:
    __________________________

14. Do you offer any of the following services to the public?
    14.1. Nursery
    14.2. Cleaning and shearing for dogs/cats
    14.3. Dog training
    14.4. Boarding kennels
    14.5. Other

15. Do you know the Directive 407/2009/CE related to the preservation of wild flora and fauna?
    ☐ Yes  ☐ No (Go to 17)
16. Could you indicate some requirements of this Directive?

___________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________

17. Place of residence: ......................

18. Year of birth: ......................

19. Gender:  □ Male  □ Female
Appendix 11: Questionnaire from zoo personnel

Date: ___________________ Query (Z)_________________

1. Please specify: park, natural reserve or Zoo

2. Specify the kind of species: only native species or also exotic ones:

3. Your daily functions in here consist of:
   3.1. Receiving the animals and reviewing the documentation
   3.2. Feeding and watering the animals
   3.3. Checking the conditions of the animals
   3.4. Putting down ill or injured animals
   3.5. Cleaning and maintaining the facilities
   3.6. Implementing educational activities for the public
   3.7. Implementing the entertainment shows with the animals
   3.8. Issues unrelated to animals
   3.9. Scientific communicator (magazines, website, etc)
   3.10. Other

4. What is your education/academic background?
   4.1. No formal education
   4.2. Secondary high education
   4.3. Education in animal nutrition
   4.4. Education in environmental or conservation issues
   4.5. Technician veterinary assistant
   4.6. Veterinary
   4.7. Other

5. What do you think Animal Welfare means? (Open question):

   (FROM QUESTION 5 -FOR THE ASSESSMENT OF THE INTERVIEWER) The interviewed shows.../seems.../mentions the term.../makes reference to...:
   5.1. Suffering
   5.2. Emotions
   5.3. Happiness
   5.4. Stress
   5.5. Natural conditions/ Freedom
   5.6. Clean surrounding/ healthy
   5.7. Behaviour
   5.8. Vet-Medical care
   5.9. Nutrition/Food
   5.10. Other

6. In your opinion, what’s your level of knowledge in animal welfare?

   No Knowledge | 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | High Knowledge
7. Have you ever been trained in animal welfare?
   ☐ Yes    ☐ No (Go to 9)

8. When was the last time you received training on animal welfare (whether technical or legislative)? _______ months ago

9. How many trainings or courses on animal welfare have you received in the last 5 years?
   ☐ Less than 5    ☐ More than 5
   ☐ More than 10   ☐ None

10. You have acquired your knowledge on animal welfare through:
    10.1. Specific training on animal welfare
    10.2. As part of other general education
    10.3. Specific TV programmes / documentaries
    10.4. As part of other regulated or unregulated courses
    10.5. Conferences/Seminars/Workshop
    10.6. Professional experience
    10.7. Other:

11. Do you normally receive updated information on animal welfare?
    ☐ Yes    ☐ No (Go to 13)

12. This information you receive it via:
    (Please cross with an X)
    12.1. News from TV and radio
    12.2. Spots from TV and radio
    12.3. Specific programs/ radio or TV documentaries
    12.4. Generalist newspapers
    12.5. Specialized magazines
    12.6. Books
    12.7. Professional experience
    12.8. Conferences/ Workshops/ Seminars
    12.9. Fairs/ Exhibitions
    12.10. Informative campaigns
    12.11. Awareness campaigns
    12.12. Specialized websites on the internet
    12.13. General manager / other colleagues
    12.14. Others

13. Do you know whether informative or training initiatives related to animal welfare are performed/ offered in your region?
    ☐ Yes    ☐ No

14. Please indicate any of these initiatives related to animal welfare in which you have participated in the last year:

___________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________________

15. Does the park organize specific educational activities for children and teenagers?
    ☐ Yes    ☐ No (Go to 17)

16. Please indicate any of these initiatives that was related to animal welfare:

___________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________________

17. Does the park organize any educational activities for the visitors?
    ☐ Yes    ☐ No (Go to 19)

18. Please indicate any of these initiatives that was related to animal welfare:

___________________________________________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________________________________________
19. Do you know the Directive 1999/22/EC related to the keeping of wild animals in “zoos”? □ Yes □ No
   (Go to 21)

20. Could you indicate some requirements of this Directive?
   
21. Place of residence: ......................

22. Year of birth: ......................

23. Gender:  □ Male  □ Female
Appendix 12: List of contacts to obtain information

1. Education and informative campaigns to general public, consumers and students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organization</th>
<th>Name of the organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Asociación Dejando Huella Cáceres</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FEPAEX</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Sociedad Protectora de Animales de Cáceres</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>PACMA EXTREMADURA</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>APAP Alcalá</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FAADA</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Fundación Altarriba Barcelona</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>FEDENVA</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Animal Welfare and Trade</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Department of Ethology Institute of Animal Science</td>
<td>CZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Born Free Foundation</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>World Society for the Protection of Animals</td>
<td>International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Humane Slaughter Association</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Compassion in World Farming</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>(RSCPA) The Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Animlas’ Angels</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Eurogroup for Animals</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary organizacion</td>
<td>The National Food Agency</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary organizacion</td>
<td>Główny Inspektorat Weterynarii</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Lithuanian Veterinary Medical Association</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>British Veterinary Association</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>VSI &quot;Tęśtinio Mokymo ir Konsultavimo Centras&quot;</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Ogólnopolskie Towarzystwo Ochrony Żwierząt – OTOZ Animals</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Straż dla Zwierząt w Polsce</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Stowarzyszenie Ochrony Zwierząt EKOSTRAŻ</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural association</td>
<td>Małopolskie Stowarzyszenie Rolników Ekologicznych „Natura”</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural association</td>
<td>Polskie Zrzeszenie Producentów Bydła Mięsnego</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural association</td>
<td>POLSUS. Polski Związek Hodowców i Producentów Trzody Chlewnej</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural association</td>
<td>Wojewódzki Związek Hodowców i Producentów Druhu</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural association</td>
<td>Polska Federacja Hodowców Bydła i Producentów Mleka</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary organizacion</td>
<td>State Food and Veterinary Service and the National Food</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>San felipe Neri</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Instituto Ramón del Vallé Inclán</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Gymnasium of Akademija</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Gymnasium of Baisogala</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Kedainiai youth school (special)</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>KTU gymnasium (special)</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Gymnasium of Babtai</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Vyduono secondary school of Klaipeda</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Punkt gymnasium of S.Darius ir S. Girenas</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Sejny secondary school „Ziburys”</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Liceum Ogólnokształcące Nr. II im. Jana III Sobieskiego</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>XX Liceum Ogólnokształcące</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Zespol szkol Nr 1</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Nr. 8 im. Jana Pawlall</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Zespol szkol Ogólnokształcących</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Nr. 8 im. Jana Pawlall</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Rosendalsgymnasiet (middle school)</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Bolandgymnasiet</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Ostra gymnasiet</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Dragnskolan (gymnasium)</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Hitfeldtska gymnasiet</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Sjolins ekonomiska gymnasium</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>School of Agriculture, Food &amp; Rural Development Agriculture Building Newcastle University Newcastle</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>School of Veterinary Science</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Scotland Rural College</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| University | Jeanne Marchig International Centre for Animal Welfare Education  
The Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies  
The University of Edinburgh | UK |
| University | Department of Animal Environment and Health Section Ethology and Animal Welfare  
Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences | SE |
| University | Universität für Bodenkultur Wien  
University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna | AU |
| University | Institute of Animal Husbandry and Animal Welfare. University of Veterinary Medicine, Vienna | AU |
| University | Universität Kassel | DE |
| College (Rural) | Rural Research, Education and Consulting (SRUC) | UK |
| University | University of Bristol | UK |
| College | bsi schwarzenbek  
(Training and consultancy Institute for Transport and Slaughterhouse) | DE |
| College | Voogd Consulting, Inc. | USA |
| University | University of A.Stulginskis (ASU) | LT |
| University | Vilniaus university (VU) | LT |
| University | University of Klaipėda (KU) | LT |
| University | Veterinary academy of Lithuanian university of health sciences (LSMU VA) | LT |
| University | Jagiellonian university (UJ) | PL |
| University | University of Gdansk (UG) | PL |
| University | Universiteit of Wroclaw (UW) | PL |
| University | Poznan university of life sciences (PULS) | PL |
| University | Lund university (LU) | SE |
| University | Swedish university of agricultural sciences (SLU) | SE |
| University | Umea university (UU) | SE |
| University | Goteborg university (GU) | SE |
2. Training and information to professionals working with animals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of organization</th>
<th>Name of the organization</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RTD centre</td>
<td>Unité Gestion des élevages</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>VetAgro Sup Campus Vétérinaire de Lyon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD centre</td>
<td>Institut du Porc</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University &amp; Research centre</td>
<td>Wageningen UR Livestock Research</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Swedish University of Agricultural Science</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD centre</td>
<td>Wageningen UR Livestock Research</td>
<td>NL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD centre</td>
<td>UMRH - Adaptation et Comportements Sociaux</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Centre</td>
<td>Directrice de l’Unité Mixte de Recherche sur les Herbivores</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Agency</td>
<td>Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) (Executive agency working on behalf of the Department for the Environment, Food &amp; Rural Affairs (Defra), Scottish and Welsh Government)</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Centre</td>
<td>centro ricerche produzioni animali s.p.a</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Centre</td>
<td>Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research</td>
<td>BE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Centre</td>
<td>Bundesforschungsinstitut für Tiergesundheit</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Centre</td>
<td>Institut de l'Élevage Service Santé et Bien-être des Ruminants</td>
<td>FR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Centre</td>
<td>Dip. Scienze e Tecnologie Veterinarie per la Sicurezza Alimentare</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTD Centre</td>
<td>Jülich Research Centre</td>
<td>DE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official veterinaries</td>
<td>Krajowa Izba Lekarsko - Weterynaryjna</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official veterinaries</td>
<td>Valstybinė maisto ir veterinarijos tarnyba</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>pigs, cattles, horses and sheep</td>
<td>SP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>cattle, sheep, horses, turkey, laying hens, fishes, geese, pigs</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>ANIMEX-TRANS Sp. z o.o.</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>Tarka</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouse</td>
<td>Rzeźnia Braci Szypcio Spółka Jawna</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slaughterhouse</td>
<td>UBOJNIA ZWIERZĄT ROBERT RYTEL</td>
<td>PL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>UAB Dovainonių paukštynas</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>Marius Steponavičius</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>Arvydas Karpis</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>Valdas Urbonas</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>UAB „Saerimner“</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>ZUB „Gražionų bekonas“</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>UAB Patronesė</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>Andrius Ciškevičius</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>Aurimo Bartkevičius - gyvūnų vežėjas</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>UAB „Marijonas“</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>UAB „Vasaknos“</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>UAB „Kasandros grupė“</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>UAB „Utenos mėsa“</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>AB Vilniaus paukštynas</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transporter</td>
<td>AB Vievio paukštynas</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>pigs</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>sheep</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>poultry</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>ES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>pigs</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>pets</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary</td>
<td>cattle</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>Animal production</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 13: Interview to Copa-cogeca

FARMERS’ INVOLVEMENT IN ANIMAL WELFARE TRAINING/EDUCATION AND INFORMATION ACTIVITIES ACROSS MEMBER STATES

WORKING DOCUMENT

I. INTRODUCTION

1. In January 2012, the European Commission adopted an “EU Strategy for the protection and well-being of animals 2012-2020”, which highlights the need to further improve knowledge on animal welfare amongst stakeholders, including the awareness of alternative practices for better animal welfare within production systems.

2. Copa-Cogeca pays great attention to proper education and knowledge transfer at farm level. However, the EU Strategy does not fully recognize farmers’ expertise on animal welfare and their efforts to comply with high standards of production in the European Union.

Furthermore, the strategy underestimates the structural limits faced by European farmers when making long term investments in animal welfare (e.g. market instabilities, unbalanced food chain, free market competition with third countries, access to bank loans and level of risk involved, etc.).

At the same time, the lack of farmer involvement in research and innovation projects, together with the practicalities and acceptances of new production methods amongst consumers, may further limit the implementation of new production systems.

In other words, the lack of investments into alternative practices cannot always be associated with a lack of farmer knowledge, but it certainly has a multifactorial dimension.

3. Copa-Cogeca firmly believes in proper knowledge on animal welfare as a relevant aspect of good herd management. However, experience acquired by European farmers should be properly recognized and documenting their skills should not create further administrative burdens at farm level.

4. In 2012, Copa-Cogeca launched an internal survey to collect and promote relevant information on training activities, awareness campaigns and other activities conducted by farmers with the objective of improving animal welfare at farm level.

This working document attempts to provide an open source of information to be shared amongst Copa-Cogeca member organisations. The information provided is based on voluntary and non-exhaustive contributions from national experts and is updated regularly.
II. KEY MESSAGES

Training/education/awareness programmes for farmers

1. Results confirm that even in cases where a specific level of knowledge on animal welfare is not officially required by EU/national legislation, farmers possess extensive skills and competence on animal welfare. This may be due to competences gained through everyday work experience with farm animals or some type of training or proper education taken in agricultural schools during their professional career.

2. Strengths – several initiatives on welfare education are already underway in many EU Member States. These may be in the form of training courses, guides of good practices, online publications/databases, dedicated websites or even initiatives promoted by public authorities, farmers' organisations, expert groups and veterinarians associations to actively guarantee adherence to the standards in place. Solutions are clearly tailored to specific needs at farm level and are not based on prescriptive top-down rules.

Animal welfare is often part of a broader concept of knowledge transfer at farm level which may also include elements such as feeding, animal health, husbandry practices, etc.

3. Weaknesses – farmers are mostly willing to take part in training activities related to animal welfare when the benefits are clearly defined. However, this should not only be seen as mandatory compliance with legal requirements, but also as a way of improving economic performance at farm level. Nevertheless, recurring obstacles preventing farmers from participating in training programmes have been pointed out by all organisations. These obstacles can vary from a lack of help on the farm while the farmer is away, to a lack of financial support, or even the irrelevance of the course to the farmer's actual needs. At the same time, especially in remote areas, several difficulties are highlighted in terms of accessibility to training programmes, including limited availability of on-farm courses.

4. Very few people know what the European Commission (EC) does in terms of communication. Farmers do not have a clear understanding of where legislation comes from (EU or Member State). Communication has not always been effective. Specialists can gain access to certain communication tools (newsletters, websites, etc.), but these are generally not particularly farmer-friendly.

The purpose and target audience of EC communications are not always clear. It is important to differentiate more clearly between the intended targets: e.g. farmers/general public/children or EU/third countries. When drafting communication material, the European Commission should take into consideration what the message might mean to dairy/pig/poultry farmers. One message does not fit all. Better coordination between the European Commission and the Member State authorities could certainly help to better disseminate EC communication messages to farmers at local level.

Education/awareness programmes for the general public

5. Great effort is put into promoting animal welfare to the general public through mass-media and public events. Proper and reliable awareness campaigns are considered to be an essential element for consumers and the non-farming community. These should contain correct and transparent information in order to enable consumers to fully understand the work carried out by farmers on a daily basis and the crucial role played by agriculture in national economies.

Institutions and other stakeholders should pay greater attention to this key point, helping the farming community to properly manage their communication on the issue of animal welfare.

Consumers still lack sufficient knowledge about the farming sector and the high standards of production with which farmers have to regularly comply. It is often the case that consumers have different perceptions or priorities when thinking of animal welfare.

\[1\] AT, BE, DK, EE, ES, FI, FR, HU, IE, IT, LV, LT, NL, PL, PT, SE, SW, UK.
compared to those of a professional operator (e.g. farmers). This has also been confirmed by the Welfare Quality project.

There is still a need for objective communication, in which emotions can be separated from the real needs of animals. Society is often unaware of the impact of animal welfare on food security, production, biodiversity, the environment, food safety, etc. Animal welfare has to be put into context. Copa-Cogeca believes that animal welfare is part of a multi-dimensional and complex system. Farmers have to comply with a number of requirements and are often faced with several dilemmas (e.g. pig castration vis-a-vis market/consumer acceptance of meat). The “EU production model” should be presented as a whole concept rather than just focusing on one part of it (i.e. welfare).

There are clear conflicts and a lack of consistency between the EU Animal Welfare Policy and other EU policy areas, such as environmental regulation, which should also be taken into account. Changes in farming systems in order to comply with animal welfare requirements have environmental implications and have the potential to affect greenhouse gas emissions, be it in an intensive or extensive manner. These trade-offs should be examined further, in particular concerning water, biodiversity and climate change policy.

Welfare education in secondary schools/university

6. General welfare knowledge is considered an essential element to promote at secondary schools and non-specialised universities. It is important to have a general understanding of the farming system, where food comes from and how to ensure healthy diets in the European Union.

Great concern has been raised by the farming community with regard to the Commission’s FarmInMind tool as the messages communicated to children are quite misleading and far from what actually happens on a typical farm. It is not representative of modern farming and shows animals walking freely around the farm. This demeans the farmers’ efforts to control disease, to maintain any form of health and safety in the workplace and to protect the welfare of the animals and farm personnel.

It is important to ensure a practical approach to animal welfare learning programmes (e.g. farm visits) and the European Commission could play a role in funding such initiatives.

It is, however, a Member State’s responsibility to ensure that students have access to some basic knowledge of farming, including animal welfare. It is difficult, if not impossible, to have prescriptive rules at EU level.
III. DETAILED INFORMATION ON MEMBER STATE INITIATIVES

AUSTRIA

Austria does not officially require farmers to meet a specific level of knowledge on animal welfare before starting their professional career, but they can decide to participate in specific programmes via the Austrian Animal Health Service.

Training sessions on animal welfare are arranged by the Rural Education Institute. Around 9,000 courses have been organised in the last five years, of which 1,317 were conducted in 2012 with the involvement of 9,658 participants.

The main reasons for which farmers attend training courses are the need to comply with legal requirements, to refresh their knowledge, and to improve farm performance. On the other hand, farmers often feel that further training is not necessary, as their current skills are sufficient for their farming needs and they already comply with current legislation. In this case, they would not take part into any courses or training sessions.

Awareness programmes/campaigns on animal welfare at farm level

The main tools used to spread information on animal welfare at farm level are articles published in agricultural media (e.g. the press, internet), seminars conducted by experts, and handbooks and brochures sent out by the Austrian Farmers’ Association. For example, specific training courses are organised in the form of train the trainers focused on specialists/technicians who are in charge of spreading relevant information on animal welfare to other farmers. Groups of 40-50 participants (particularly young farmers) are educated to develop and conduct seminars on how to evaluate animal welfare, and raise awareness amongst farmers regarding animal welfare measures. Around 50,000 brochures on animal health and welfare containing legal specifications and other relevant information (e.g. measures on new stables and their renovation) have been sent to all farmers operating in Austria. Furthermore, handbooks have been published as a further means of training in order to facilitate on-farm assessments of animal welfare.

The main objectives behind the activities promoted by the Austrian farming sector are principally related to improving the overall quality of the farm, increasing its added value and guaranteeing consumer protection by reducing or avoiding, where possible, giving medication to animals, as well as recognising animal health problems early on.

Such initiatives have shown significant improvements at farm level, such as productivity gains, increased awareness, investments in new technology and new husbandry systems.

Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public

The Austrian chambers of agriculture, farmers’ associations, farming specialists and the Ministry of Agriculture are in charge of spreading information on animal welfare to the general public, via the press (e.g. farmers’ newspapers), their own websites and public activities.

BELGIUM

In Belgium, there are no regular educational/vocational programmes that have to be attended during a farmer’s professional career. However, poultry farmers and transport operators have to meet specific qualifications regarding animal welfare.

Poultry farmers have to take educational courses on animal welfare before starting their business but no further training is required.
Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public

Federal public authorities use brochures, posters and public campaigns to promote activities which aim to improve the general public’s knowledge of animal welfare, including mistreatment of animals. Nevertheless, the farming community believes that these initiatives often lead to unproductive discussions.

DENMARK

In Denmark, in order to become a specialised farmer in livestock production, it is mandatory to complete a training programme at school of at least 3 years and to have 5-11 months of work experience. School courses entail direct knowledge transfer, particularly on how to take responsibility for daily livestock care (e.g. topics such as feeding and adjusting diets based on animal life cycles, nutritional status, etc.). Farmers also learn how to manage and prevent diseases that affect livestock and how to respond to abnormal conditions in the livestock herd.

Furthermore, knowledge is also provided on how to handle unforeseen events and react to abnormalities in the herd. Particular attention is devoted to the transport of animals, including legislation on animal welfare, assessment of animal fittings for transport, natural animal behaviour and well-being, productivity and the working environment. They also learn how to operate and maintain machinery and technical installations and other production equipment used in animal husbandry, including a basic understanding of the economics of livestock production. The programme has a compulsory basic course of 20 weeks and a main course that includes practical training and education. School instruction in the main programme is divided into two school periods of 16 and 20 weeks.

The requirements of the aforementioned education help to acquire the necessary skills outlined in the EU Directive on the protection of pigs.

When it comes to the necessary skills for broiler producers, these skills must be acquired before they can even start producing, which in turn requires an additional course. This course is officially approved and implemented by the industry but is financed by farmers and contains the requirements described in the Directive for the protection of broilers.

In addition, mink producers require mandatory training that consists of a theoretical part and a practical part in order to set up a mink farm with a mandatory health management programme.

Farmers who own more than 100 milking cows have to sign a contract with a veterinarian describing the various goals and actions regarding animal welfare and health improvement. 90% of all dairy farms have this type of contract.

Moreover, the authorities require that the larger cattle and pig herds (e.g. more than 100 adult cattle, 200 young cattle, 300 sows, gilts or boars in the stable, 6000 piglet stables) have a health advisory agreement with a private veterinarian. If even one limit is exceeded, the farmer must obtain an advisory agreement: approximately 75% of the country’s cattle population and about 95% of the country’s pig population is covered by this programme. Health advice from the veterinarian must be based on the veterinarian’s and farmer’s observations, and on the relevant production data and other relevant records. Advice can be given in the following fields: health and production (e.g. study of risks and causes of high mortality), antibiotic resistance and zoonoses (e.g. instruction in relation to drug use and national action plans on zoonosis control), herd diagnoses, treatment guidelines, and animal welfare, including the audit of internal controls (e.g. transportability, causes of high cull rates, etc.).

Owners of cattle herds with a ‘module 2’ agreement in health counselling can take theoretical and practical courses in treating retained placenta infection and milk fever. After completion of the theoretical and practical course, the veterinarian issues a course certificate to the farmer. Course certificates are to be submitted to the authorities, who then sign an authorisation for the farmer. Farmers must obtain a license before dealing with retained placenta infection and milk
fever on their own. For the same reason, farmers must show a valid authorisation before the veterinarian can print prescriptions for these disorders.

**Awareness programmes/campaigns on animal welfare at farm level**

In 2003, the Danish Pig Association initiated an extensive campaign to reduce animal welfare problems in the Danish pig sector. The campaign was aimed at herd owners, herd employees, veterinarians, etc. An important part of the campaign was to reduce the number of animals that either died or had to be killed in the herd due to poor animal welfare. Moreover, the Danish Pig Association also provided special courses to teachers at agriculture schools on animal welfare for pigs in order to ensure that the most up-to-date knowledge and practical experiences could be applied at school.

The Danish cattle programmes focus on reducing mortality, reducing claw and leg diseases, reducing mastitis, and preventing shoulder wounds to livestock.

The aim of Danish awareness raising programmes on animal welfare is to implement a series of SOPs (Standard Operating Procedures) and learning tools in the daily management activities of the farm. Standard Operating Procedures in beef farming and pig farming are easy to understand and are quite illustrative. The system ensures that the daily work performed by farmers and employees is carried out correctly and efficiently in order to ensure a good level of animal welfare.

Awareness campaigns are mostly carried out for milking cows in the beef farming production sector and pigs/sows in the pig farming production sector.

Figures for mortality rates at farm and national level, videos, specialised advisors, and SOPs are the tools available to farmers. Manuals of good management practices and ensuring animal welfare for Danish pig producers have been developed thanks to the EU Fund for Rural Development and the Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries, which helped finance the project.

The body in charge of organising awareness campaigns is mainly the Knowledge Centre of Agriculture, which is a branch of the Danish Agriculture and Food Council.

Participation in these training courses often results in productivity gains (lower levels of diseases and mortality) and increased awareness.

**Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public**

No specific activities on animal welfare are promoted amongst the general public, but several projects are underway for agriculture and organic food. Specific brands promote animal welfare at retailer level. The Danish Agriculture & Food Council is the main promoter of awareness campaigns.

---

**FINLAND**

Even though Finland does not require farmers to meet a specific level of knowledge on animal welfare before starting their professional careers, except for broiler producers, and no regular educational programmes are organised on this issue, several tools are used to monitor farmers' skills on animal health and animal welfare.

Educational programmes (animal welfare, medication and treatment, disease protection and prevention, appropriate killing etc.) are offered both by farmers' organisations and public

---

1. [http://www.planenuecheitzen.de/AntiK性疾病.aspx](http://www.planenuecheitzen.de/AntiK性疾病.aspx)
2. [http://www.landkreisinfo.de/Presse/SOP/Slider-Vorschaue_SOP.html?List=09082007-dde1-15741-b496-1366b1ce80&b1=downloadLizen][http://www.landkreisinfo.de/Presse/SOP/Slider-Vorschaue_SOP.html?List=09082007-dde1-15741-b496-1366b1ce80&b1=downloadLizen]
3. [http://vop.f.de/Video/Video.aspx](http://vop.f.de/Video/Video.aspx)
4. [http://vop.f.de/Video/IViVorbehandlungen/Manuale.aspx](http://vop.f.de/Video/IViVorbehandlungen/Manuale.aspx)
authorities, and are usually funded by EU programmes on rural development. They are mostly organised to train pig farmers. Almost all Finnish pig farmers take part in these programmes.

Laying hen producers are trained on appropriate killing methods for hens and guidelines on this issue have been published and made available to farmers.

Broiler producers are educated on animal welfare and animal welfare indicators through courses arranged and funded by the public authorities.

As far as the dairy cow sector is concerned, several animal welfare and health projects are underway (6-10 projects): they have been arranged by private and public institutions and funded partly by EU programmes, by the public authorities and private organisations (farmers and industry). The main focus is on animal welfare and management, e.g. hoof health and lameness, and udder health. Approximately 55-75% of dairy farmers are involved in these vocational training courses.

A campaign on animal welfare for sheep has also been implemented very successfully thanks to EU and state funding, including support from sheep farmers’ organisations.

In conclusion, 95% of pig farmers, 95% of dairy farmers, and 100% of broiler farmers participate in such training programmes, showing positive results in terms of productivity gains, increased awareness, and investment in new technology, including new husbandry systems.

**Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public**

No specific campaigns on animal welfare are currently underway to raise awareness amongst the general public.

---

**FRANCE**

Although animal welfare is not part of a regular educational/vocational programme addressed to farmers during their professional career, specific skills and levels of knowledge are required for poultry farmers to start their business. Holding a specific certificate (*Certificat professionnel et individuel de l'éleveur de poulet de chair – CPIEPC*) is mandatory and includes basic standards for all broiler producers. 90% of poultry farmers have obtained this certificate based on an assessment of their “first-hand” skills, but a specific training course on animal welfare is now mandatory for all new broiler farmers. There is a general interest in this issue from farmers because of its direct link with public perception.

Except for the broiler sector, no specific courses regarding animal welfare are organised and available data show that farmers do not consider training on this particular topic to be an essential part of their education.

Animal welfare is also discussed at professional schools or universities by livestock experts. Due to a lack of supporting material and specific guides for teachers, specific training programmes, up-to-date information, and a standard teaching method have recently been developed for all schools in France. As a consequence, the network *Réseau Mixte Technologique* (RNT) was established in 2006. This is a scientific and technological network whose purpose is to foster and sponsor research and development on animal welfare. It contains more than 80 members with different areas of expertise and facilitates knowledge transfer and sharing of best-practices, and rural development and training activities. It has a multidisciplinary approach and includes all species of livestock in the food chain, from farm to fork. The RNT is managed by a board, which is responsible for organising all activities and works in consultation with an advisory committee and a steering committee, where stakeholder representatives are also involved. The network has recently established a working group to carry out an exhaustive study on basic and further education on animal welfare in order to identify obstacles as well as incentives to ensure improvements to the system. This objective is reached through the development of new
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educational materials that can improve training on animal welfare, addressed to livestock experts and teachers.

Broiler farmers must hold an Individual Professional Certificate issued by the public authorities. Training is provided by an educational body approved by the Ministry of Agriculture and courses deal with national and EU legislation on broiler welfare, with a particular focus on physiology, nutritional schemes, behaviour, stress-related problems, prevention of illness, protection during transport, and slaughter.

Within the cattle sector, the Institut de l'élevage helped draft a multimedia training programme as part of the EU project “Welfare Quality”; a French version of the tool is available but until now it has not been used for any educational courses. In addition, the Institut de l'élevage, together with the Mutualité Sociale Agricole (MSA), has been involved, both on a theoretical and practical level, in training the trainers specialised in beef production. Moreover, since 2008 the Institut offers training courses to farmers on how to evaluate and improve animal welfare at farm level, as well as awareness raising campaigns concerning regulatory standards.

For sheep and goat farmers, as part of the EU “Hygiene Package”, a guide to best practices for sheep9 was published in 2011 with the collaboration of regional and national agricultural organisations and institutions. Several topics were addressed in this document, such as the transport of animals, health management, and the evaluation and detection of illnesses.

As part of EU Regulation No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport, several institutions in France (e.g. Institut de l'élevage, IFIP, etc.), together with several agricultural colleges, have established well defined procedures for all operators dealing with the transport of live animals (e.g. bovines, poultry, sheep, goats, pigs, horses). Furthermore, all operators who transport animals should hold a special certificate to prove that they have a sufficient level of knowledge, the so-called Certificat d' Aptitude Professionnelle pour le Transport d' Animaux Vivants (CAPTAV). A similar approach is also used for operators under EU Regulation No 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing.

French training courses are partially financed by farmers and partly by VIVEA5, a fund established in 2001 by agricultural trade unions and national agricultural institutions.

In France, it has been noticed that the main reasons for which farmers attend training courses are the need to comply with legal requirements, and to improve farm performance and the working environment, including better livestock management. However, time constraints and the lack of help on the farm while the farmer is away still represent the main barriers preventing farmers from taking such courses.

As part of awareness programmes on animal welfare at farm level, stakeholders have promoted several activities: a first example of a customised initiative is the publication of the “Guide to good farming practices for animal production”8, which supports farmers in improving their management techniques, while at the same time complying with requests from other food chain partners and consumers. The implementation of the guidelines is on a voluntary basis. When subscribing to it, each farmer takes on 5 fundamental commitments: ensure animal traceability, take care of livestock health, provide animals with a balanced, healthy, and appropriate diet, protect milk quality through strict hygienic rules (for dairy livestock), guarantee animal welfare and personal security, and actively participate in environmental protection.

Another relevant contribution is the “Code of good practices for goat farming”10. This is a unique tool to support farmers with their daily management activities, including compliance with legislation. In adhering to the Code, farmers agree to comply with 42 good practices related to 10 main fields: general aspects, identification, sanitary certification, livestock health

---

11 http://www.vives.fr/page/default.aspx
12 Charte des bonnes pratiques d’élevage - http://www.charte.delevage.fr/
13 Code Mutuel de Bonnes Pratiques en élevage caprin - http://www.bivovivresreduitdecherve.fr/Je-prote-t/animal/le-code-
mutuel-de-bonnes-pratiques-en-elevage-caprin.html
management, dietary regime, milk production, reproduction, animal welfare and hygiene, husbandry systems and breeding of young animals.

Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public

The Chambers of Agriculture and interbranch organisations are mainly involved in promoting animal welfare amongst the general public. Several initiatives have been implemented to raise public awareness on animal welfare. The Information Meat Centre (CIV), an association providing information on meat production, farming and food security, recently published several documents\(^1\) that have been used for the general public during fairs and exhibitions at national and regional level, as well as in schools.

GERMANY

In Germany, the specific level of knowledge and competencies on animal welfare that farmers have to meet before starting their career is reached through different means: professional training (apprenticeships, technical university, degree, etc.), mandatory certificates of competence, or specific courses as part of vocational training. Animal welfare is part of regular educational/vocational programmes directed at farmers, particularly as far as animal husbandry and feeding, animal welfare laws, and livestock farming regulations are concerned.

A course with a final examination to become a farmer is approved by public authorities and is mandatory for all farmers dealing with dairy cows, cattle, broilers, laying hens and pigs. In the case of sheep and goats, competence is linked to husbandry (with tests), shearing and slaughter, while for horses it is mainly linked to competence in animal keeping and transport (with tests).

Different initiatives are promoted at farm level to raise awareness on animal welfare amongst farmers, especially regarding pigs, cattle and poultry. For example, expert panels made up of public authorities, farmers’ associations and scientists; regular information provided in specialised publications; and organising state competitions on humane husbandry, awarding farmers with animal welfare prizes in individual federal states. Such initiatives are developed in order to facilitate the use of new knowledge on husbandry and feeding gained in the field in order to improve animal husbandry and welfare, to discuss current topics and problems, and to foster education through the spread of brochures at public events.

Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public

In Germany, the general public has a particular interest in animal welfare issues, and it has been reported that this is one of the top three aspects that they consider when buying or thinking about agricultural products. Nevertheless, a widespread lack of acceptance related to modern agricultural techniques, particularly as far as livestock farming, animal transport, and husbandry are concerned, has been reported and shapes German public opinion. Farmers’ associations and agricultural institutions work together to involve the general public and increase acceptance and transparency on these issues, promoting correct understanding through the provision of truthful information to consumers and through a proper explanation of how the livestock farming sector really functions.

The most relevant tools used to raise awareness on animal welfare are brochures, websites, such as Aid-infodienst\(^2\) that provide information at schools and directly to consumers, trade fairs

\(^1\) E.g. https://www.civ.de/file/photo/alimentation-des-besoins-rationne-moyenne-astuce-alimentaire.pdf
\(^2\) https://www.aid.de/
(e.g. Green Week, agricultural trade fairs in individual Federal States, etc.), social media and, occasionally, radio advertisements.

Awareness campaigns aim to promote farmers’ public image and to facilitate direct interaction between the public and professionals; the main message that promotional activities on animal welfare are trying to spread is that farmers, not environmentalists or citizens, are the real experts and they are trained to properly manage farm animals.

Since 2010, the consumer-oriented campaign “Working with Passion” has been promoted in metropolitan areas by the German Farmers’ Association to spread a positive image of husbandry using slogans such as “I do not mistreat animals” and giving a “human face” to farming; the 2020 campaign was awarded by the EU Commission with the third prize during the 50th anniversary of the CAP in the category “Communication with society”. Moreover, YouTube videos in which farmers explain their work and their role in society and encourage people to visit their farms have been released and viewed by more than 5,000 people.

The main bodies responsible for managing educational activities are farmers’ associations, chambers of agriculture, and commercial businesses in cooperation with farmers’ associations.

HUNGARY

Hungary requires farmers to meet a specific level of knowledge on the topic before entering their professional careers. Furthermore, animal welfare is a part of agricultural studies at university level.

Skills monitoring schemes are in place to evaluate farmers’ ability to meet animal welfare standards and are carried out by the National Food Safety Office, the body in charge of running the educational programmes.

In the last five years, the National Agricultural Advisory, Educational and Rural Development Institute promoted 1,375 compulsory programmes and 281 courses. During the same period, the National Safety Office organised 2,827 free training programmes.

The courses and training programmes are financed by EU funds, state funds, or private sources.

The main reasons why farmers attend training courses are the need to comply with legal requirements, to improve farm performance, and to refresh their knowledge. As for barriers that prevent farmers from undergoing training, time constraints are most definitely the principal element, followed by low correspondence to farmers’ needs, and the lack of help on farm while the farmer is away.

In order to promote awareness on animal welfare amongst farmers and improve quality indicators, programmes such as the one promoted by the Hungarian Poultry Product Board have been organised. Since these activities are mainly promoted by product boards, it is difficult to precisely estimate the number of farmers involved each year. Other bodies involved in organising awareness campaigns at farm level are the Chambers of Agriculture, the National Food Safety Office and competent authorities in general.

Several improvements have been noted at farm level as a result of these initiatives, in particular more awareness and new investments in technology, including husbandry systems.

Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public

Product boards also promote awareness campaigns on animal welfare amongst the general public through the press, TV adverts and informative videos online.

---

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ADGerGojwaQ
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ADGerGojwaQ
IRELAND

In Ireland, some specific criteria have to be met to start a professional career in breeding: farmers must take part in specific programmes to ensure compliance with all animal welfare obligations and to have their premises approved by the Department of Agriculture. Moreover, in order to qualify for payment under certain animal welfare schemes, specific vocational or educational programmes must be completed.

The Irish Public Authority actively monitors farmers’ skills to guarantee their compliance with common standards of animal welfare. Several tools are in place for this purpose: for example a mandatory training programme covering animal welfare provisions, and breeding and record keeping established within the Suckler Cow Welfare Scheme. This programme is financed by public funding and involves around 35,000 suckler farmers.

Both the Farm Animal Welfare Advisory Council and the Agriculture and Food Development Authority (Teagasc) run campaigns to improve animal welfare at farm level for all species, with 30-50% of Irish farmers participating.

Codes of practice for the welfare of each species, guidelines, publications, papers, videos, scientific reports and an official framework to prevent cruelty to animals (e.g. early warning/intervention system) are available on the Farm Animal Welfare Advisory Council (FAWAC) and Teagasc’s websites.

Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public

Agri Aware and FAWAC are the main sources that promote animal welfare amongst the general public.

Agri Aware is an independent body established in 1996 by leading agri-food businesses and associations in order to provide the general public with information and education on the importance of agriculture and food to the Irish economy.

The main objectives of this initiative include: improving the image of the agricultural, farming and food sectors; promoting greater awareness amongst the non-farming community regarding modern agricultural techniques, the rural environment, animal welfare, food quality and safety; enhancing farmers’ awareness on the importance of best farming practices to protect the environment, animal welfare and food safety; spreading information on agriculture and food in schools nationwide to inform the non-farming community about the crucial role played by the farming and agri-food industry in the Irish economy.

These objectives are achieved through organising events throughout the year, links and cooperation with schools at all levels to develop educational programmes, and publishing guides and reports. The internet and press are the main means of spreading information on the issue and raising awareness.

ITALY

---

---

---

---

---

---
Raly does not require farmers to have a specific level of knowledge or skills in the field of animal welfare before starting their careers, except for cases covered by EU mandatory requirements (e.g., broilers). Nevertheless, for some species, animal welfare is part of mandatory educational/vocational programmes for farmers, as specified under national law (D.Lgs 146/2001) and in the National Plan on Animal Welfare.

In order to comply with the recommendations set out by the Ministry of Health, educational programmes are organised with the involvement of public and private veterinarians. The National Plan on Animal Welfare provides a monitoring scheme with periodic inspections on farms.

Some regional districts provide farmers with educational materials, and several farmers’ associations develop regular plans and guidelines on animal welfare to be implemented at farm level.

**LATVIA**

Latvia provides farmers with several opportunities to acquire education on animal welfare. For example, one possibility is to enrol in specific courses provided by the Latvian University of Agriculture or by the Latvian Rural Advisory and Training Centre. All courses end with a final examination in order to receive an official certificate. Farmers’ associations also organise regular courses on animal welfare for their members, but without issuing an official certificate.

The main issue that acts as a barrier to farmers getting involved in training activities on animal welfare is the lack of information about courses and other educational options.

**LITHUANIA**

Lithuanian farmers have to have a specific level of knowledge regarding animal welfare before starting their careers. The specific topics are part of regular educational programmes that farmers have to follow.

A monitoring scheme or a continual professional development scheme is provided for pig, cattle, dairy cow, sheep and goat farmers. Training courses are usually financed through rural development programmes or other similar funding systems.

The Lithuanian Agricultural Advisory Service is responsible for organising and implementing continual vocational training for farmers. The Chambers of Agriculture, research institutes and other competent authorities also organise various courses for farmers.

As far as animal welfare is concerned, awareness campaigns are mostly carried out for cattle, pigs and dairy cows, and they focus in particular on reducing mortality and improving living conditions especially for calves. Codes of good practice on animal welfare, toolkits with relevant information and video messages are the key materials used to implement these initiatives.

Several improvements at farm level have been noticed as a result of farmers’ involvement in training programmes: more awareness, new investment in technology and new husbandry systems.

**Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public**

The State Food and Veterinary Service (SFVS) is mostly in charge of developing and implementing national policy on food safety and quality, as well as on animal health and
welfare. TV, press, radio and the internet are used as vehicles to spread information amongst the general public. These awareness campaigns are promoted by the Ministry of Agriculture and the State Food and Veterinary Service. The SFVS and the Agroakademia websites are useful sources of news and information on the issues.

**POLAND**

Poland has no legal requirements concerning permits or licences that farmers need to obtain before starting livestock production, except for the cases covered by EU mandatory requirements (e.g. broilers, pigs, CAP cross-compliance, etc.).

However, polish farmers who decide to run a farm, and particularly to buy land or benefit from programmes supporting farms, for example within the framework of RDP, have to obtain minimum professional qualifications in one of the following five categories:

1. **Vocational education in the field of agriculture, either basic, secondary or higher level.**
2. **A qualification title, a professional title or a master craftsman title in a profession useful for farming activities and at least 3 years’ practical experience on an agricultural holding.**
3. **Higher education in a field other than agriculture and at least 3 years’ practical experience on an agricultural holding, or higher education in a field other than agriculture and post-graduate studies in a field related to agriculture, or secondary education in a field other than agriculture and at least 3 years’ practical experience on an agricultural holding.**
4. **Primary, lower secondary or basic vocational education with specialization in a field other than agriculture and at least 5 years’ practical experience on an agricultural holding.**
5. **Agricultural qualifications necessary when applying for support for young farmers in a country of which the person is a national, within the framework of a similar action co-financed by the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD), if the person does not have the Polish nationality.**

Despite the fact that there is no legal obligation for continual professional development, due to constant changes in legislation, farmers have to regularly take part in training sessions organised by various bodies: farm advisory services, agricultural chambers, the General Veterinary Inspectorate, higher agricultural education institutions, the Agricultural Market Agency, the Agency for the Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture, and livestock farmers' associations, as well as by private companies providing advisory services and training. It was estimated that in the last few years about 400,000 farmers have participated in such courses.

Most of the training courses are organised by private bodies and co-financed by European funds (e.g. PHARE, SAPARD, RDP). Furthermore, the Assistance Programmes for Agriculture (FAPA) have been set up to support activities in different areas of the agricultural sector, including knowledge transfer. Some of the training sessions were financed as statutory activities by the bodies in charge of the organisation.

---

2. [http://www.agroakademia.pl/video/507d-312f79c](http://www.agroakademia.pl/video/507d-312f79c)
3. Poland and Hungary Assistance for the Restructuring of the Economy
4. Special Accession Programme for Agriculture and Rural Development
The main reasons why farmers attend training courses are the need to refresh their knowledge and to improve farm performance. In contrast, time constraints, lack of help on the farm while the farmer is away and low correspondence to farmers’ specific needs represent the main barriers that prevent farmers from participating in training courses.

Several awareness campaigns are promoted in the farming community, involving approximately 15% of Polish farmers each year. They are mostly financed by European funds and are conducted by farm advisory services, agricultural chambers, the General Veterinary Inspectorate, agricultural higher education institutions, the Agricultural Market Agency, the Agency for the Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture, livestock farmers’ associations and private companies that provide advisory services and training. The animals that are mainly covered by such programmes are dairy cows, cattle, pigs, sheep, horses and poultry. These campaigns are focused on three main topics: CAP cross-compliance obligations, animal welfare standards and new technologies. During the meetings, codes of good practice for animal welfare and information materials are provided to farmers.

**Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public**

In Poland there are no specific promotional activities to promote animal welfare standards amongst the general public. Nevertheless, the topic is occasionally covered on the television and radio, and by some relevant bodies, such as: the agricultural chambers, agricultural higher education institutions, the Agency for the Restructuring and Modernisation of Agriculture, bodies issuing organic farming certificates, and NGOs dealing with animal rights.

Such initiatives aim to raise awareness amongst the general public and consumers about the high welfare standards in place on farm level and the need to support high quality food.

However, it is noted that often the lack of objective parameters to assess animal welfare both from producers, consumers and authorities, limit the efficacy of such communication campaigns. A more EU approach on sharing of information and knowledge on animal welfare would represent an added value. This type of information is not always available in all languages of the European Union and this limits its accessibility.

---

**PORTUGAL**

Portugal has no specific obligations for farmers to meet in terms of knowledge/skills in the field of animal welfare before starting their professional careers. However, as far as certain species and systems of production are concerned, educational programmes include the issue of animal welfare according to EU legislation (e.g. broilers, pigs).

No specific courses on animal welfare are organised at farm level, and it has been noticed that farmers are often not especially keen on participating because of time constraints and low correspondence to their professional needs, or because training is often only perceived as a legal requirement to fulfil.

---

**SLOVENIA**

In Slovenia, young farmers who have no formal education on agriculture-related subjects have to acquire national qualifications on animal husbandry before starting their career.

At technical and specialised universities, animal welfare is part of the regular curriculum, both on a theoretical and a practical basis.
The Farm Advisory System provides information and continual professional development schemes on specific topics (e.g., organic livestock and welfare, ethology, welfare legislation, constructing stables, small-scale hens farming, etc.). In 2012, 4,438 Slovenian farmers were involved in these initiatives. 155 farmers participated in national vocational qualifications on animal husbandry in 2011 and 2012.

Moreover, articles about welfare for different animal species are published in "Zelena đelela"", a bulletin published by Slovenia's Chamber of Agriculture and Forestry. This is a newspaper that reaches over 90,000 farmers. Advisory activities are regularly carried out at farm level. So far, around 7,500 farmers have taken part. However, it has been noticed that the lack of training centres for farmers and advisers still constitutes a barrier for many farmers who are interested in gaining access to up-to-date information. The high average age of Slovenian farmers (57 years old) has been highlighted as a critical element to the development of vocational training.

The awareness programmes promoted by the Chambers of Agriculture and Forestry amongst Slovenian farmers have involved 15,600 cattle breeding farms and 3,150 small ruminants farms over the last few years. Moreover, each year the FAS organises a winter education programme on animal welfare with an average of around 4,500 participants.

**Awareness programmes/campaigns on animal welfare at farm level**

The Slovenian veterinary authorities develop regular awareness raising campaigns for the general public. One such programme is "My animal, my responsibility".

---

**SPAIN**

Spain does not require farmers to meet a specific level of knowledge on animal welfare before starting their professional careers, except for those cases covered by EU legislation (e.g., broilers, pigs).

No specific and regulated courses on animal welfare are organised in Spain but the issue is part of already existing educational and vocational programmes.

An official body, linked to the Ministry of Education, is in charge of ensuring that all students in agricultural faculties acquire knowledge on all relevant animal welfare legislation. At the same time, trade unions organise specific training courses each year for their members in which animal welfare is main topic of discussion. Moreover, farm technicians and public officials receive special training in order to be able to advise farmers on topics related to animal welfare.

As far as pig livestock is concerned, Spain follows EU Council Directive 2003/2006 laying down minimum standards for the protection of pigs: it is therefore mandatory for people in charge of pigs to receive relevant information on animal welfare. Courses were first organised in 2003, and since then around 25,000 pig farmers have been involved.

The main reasons for which farmers attend training courses are the need to comply with legal requirements and to improve farm performance. On the other hand, time constraints and a lack of help on the farm while the farmer is away have been highlighted as important restrictions in participating in training courses. Furthermore, it has also been recognised that such training programmes often do not meet the specific needs of farmers, covering aspects on animal welfare that are too theoretical without discussing real-life problems. At the same time, especially in remote areas, there is lack of suitable infrastructure to host the courses, as well as insufficient participant numbers to organise a course.

As far as laying hens and pigs are concerned, the Ministry of Agriculture is developing a strategy to improve animal welfare standards by using promotional and educational activities. Good practice guides and training courses for technicians and public inspectors are managed by

---

agricultural associations, under the aegis of the Ministry of Agriculture and competent regional authorities, which have to approve the materials used during the courses, as well as monitor the correct implementation of such activities. These activities are promoted for species for which specific standards of welfare have been developed (especially with regard to transport and slaughter) laying hens, pigs, broilers, and bovines. Approximately 70% of Spanish farmers have been involved in these activities through professional associations (e.g. Anprovar), agricultural associations (e.g. A.S.A.4), and public health institutions.

The main topics addressed in educational and promotional activities are related to animal housing, handing sick animals, animal physiology, transport conditions, and implementing animal welfare legislation. Good practice guides, visual presentations, video tutorials, photos and charts are the main tools distributed to farmers.

Experience confirms that such awareness activities on animal welfare have improved investments in new technologies and compliance with current legislation. As a consequence, productivity gains and increased awareness on animal welfare have been registered.

Promotion campaigns on animal welfare amongst the general public

No official awareness campaigns on animal welfare are carried out for the general public, except for those carried out by animal welfare NGOs, which tend to criticise intensive livestock farming without any constructive message.

SWEDEN

In Sweden, there are no formal requirements related to animal welfare knowledge, except in those cases covered by EU legislation (e.g. broilers, pigs). However, most farmers have some kind of agricultural education, and they are often involved in training activities or take part in advisory services in which animal welfare is the main focus. Furthermore, as part of a new animal welfare legislation, which is still under discussion, there is a proposal to have some minimum criteria for skills and education on animal health and welfare before starting a professional career.

Customised initiatives have also been developed by specific associations/sectors. For example, the Swedish Dairy Association has developed a specific scheme for animal welfare, where advisors offer farmers a wide range of courses and other services concerning animal welfare. The Swedish Poultry Meat Association organises regular courses for chicken farmers.

All pig farmers follow a voluntary quality programme that is controlled by an independent third party. Farmers are regularly evaluated on the basis of their level of compliance with animal welfare legislation. Within this framework, codes of good practice are provided which cover management aspects (e.g. how to euthanise animals), vaccination programs, etc. The majority of pig farmers have passed a compulsory course in order to be able to use veterinary medicines responsibly. Such courses also include information on animal welfare legislation. Farmers in these programmes are regularly visited by the veterinarian (at 5-8 week intervals). Since 2010, these visits also include an inspection of the welfare conditions at farm level. In case of non-compliance, the farmers’ authorisation to use medical products is withdrawn.

The Swedish Egg and Poultry Association also organises basic education for new egg farmers and employees approximately every two years and more specialised education every year. The course for new egg farmers is approximately 6 days long, while more advanced education is organised on separate educational days focused on specific topics, depending on the current state of Swedish egg production. The basic course has had 20-40 participants on each occasion.

---

The advanced training sessions are usually attended by 20-40 participants. There have been about 20 educational days during the last 5 years.

The Swedish Animal Health Service offers a range of courses and provides veterinary advice through farm visits and/or via telephone. There are also various other local activities promoted by cattle farmers’ organisations (Sveriges Nutiktsproducenter)\(^{29}\). The same approach has been implemented for sheep and goats, as well as a new web-based computer programme to provide farmers with professional help on animal welfare and animal health. The key is that the advice is based more on registered data from the farm and less on a “gut feeling”.

The Swedish Dairy association provides a lot of educational material and training courses (known as focus courses) covering a wide range of animal welfare topics (e.g., milking, automatic milking, biosecurity, udder health, antibiotics and resistance development, hoof care, animal health, calving, fertility, feeding balance, and the grazing period).

New and updated material is continuously produced. The focus concept is a three-step method that aims to enable participants to gather knowledge in a structured manner (know), be concerned about the matter (feel) in order to produce new and better performance (do). This is accomplished in a focus group, where one or more milk entrepreneurs and their employees gather together to discuss and learn about a specific welfare matter during the day. Between 2009 (date of the first course) and June 2012, there have been 4,283 participants (farmers and farming employees) out of a total number of 5,000 farmers living in Sweden. The most frequently addressed subjects are udder health, dairy cow husbandry, and calves.

The main reasons for which farmers attend training courses are the need to comply with legal requirements, to refresh their knowledge, to improve farm performance, and to take advantage of networking and exchange experiences with other farmers. In contrast, time constraints, lack of help on the farm while the farmer is away, and low correspondence to farmers’ specific needs still represent important barriers preventing farmers from participating in training courses.

Awareness campaigns on animal welfare at farm level are conducted as part of the specialised services provided within the “scheme for animal welfare”. In addition to the aforementioned focus courses, all farmers enrolled in the Swedish Milk Recording Scheme (75% of the Swedish dairy herds) have access to the web report Animal Welfare Signals (AWS), which is based on data from the Swedish cattle database. The system includes data on cattle movements, disease, milk production, and fertility. The AWS gives a comprehensive picture of the animal welfare situation on farms by using a traffic light system and statistical figures. 24 indicators were developed to analyse individual herds and these are accompanied by on-farm welfare assessments and/or economic analyses on production levels. This offers the possibility to benchmark herds with optional characteristics in terms of size, breed, production and milking system, organic production, etc. In the near future, also information related to economics of animal health and welfare will be added to the programme. The AWS focuses on 7 areas (calves, heifers, calving, feed, diseases, management, and longevity) with 2-6 indicators for each area (e.g., mortality, fertility, disease frequency). The system has been shared through livestock and breeding companies, public events, specialized press and via the internet. The AWS is widely used; during 2011, more than 13,500 reports were downloaded by more than 50% of farms.

Besides focus courses and the AWS, there are two advisory tools aimed at giving farmers an overall picture of farm animal welfare, which opens constructive discussions about possibilities for improvement:

1. ‘Health Package Milk’ is a strategic advisory veterinary service provided by specially trained veterinarians.

2. ‘Ask the Cow’ is an advisory service where animal welfare is objectively assessed on farms by specially-trained assessors using animal-based measures; it focuses on lameness, injuries and inflammation, body condition, cleanliness, and rising behaviour.

\[^{29}\text{http://www.nutiktsproducenter.se/}\]
Health Package Milk’ and ‘Ask the Cow’ have already reached 5-10% of farms and interest continues to rise. In Swedish Organic Production (KRÄV) animal-based assessments are now required under the rules for new members. In addition, the farms have to be assessed by “Ask the Cow” if they are below a certain level in the AWS.

In addition, there are more recent projects such as “Healthy udders – DMSCC less than 150,000” and a project on biosecurity. Farmers are required to comply with the animal welfare rules and regulations in Sweden and, as the Swedish rules and regulations are above the EU standard, the baseline awareness is very high in the country. Nevertheless, courses, farmers’ meetings and other projects focus on current welfare issues, e.g. shoulder ulcers in cows, pneumonia, arthritis in piglets, piglet survival, or reducing the use of antibiotics.

The main improvements seen at farm level after awareness campaigns are in both productivity gains (e.g. better feed conversion, less culling of animals, lower mortality rates, and lower incidence of shoulder ulcers in pigs) and better management, together with more investments in new technology (e.g. better ventilation), new husbandry systems, and more information exchanges amongst farmers.

Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public

The Swedish Dairy Association is the most active body that develops awareness campaigns addressed to the general public; its messages are communicated mainly through press releases but also by participation in TV and radio programmes. Dairies have produced adverts on “brogotffabriken – butter factory”, with the message that butter produced in Sweden comes from cows that are taken to pasture during the summer. Some farms invite the general public to visit when cows are taken to pasture; these types of events are extremely popular and are attended by thousands. Therefore, they contribute a great deal to positively ‘promoting’ the Swedish dairy industry.

Examples of materials used are: “Consumers must be responsible for their purchasing”38, “Post in discussion about tied stalls”34, “Taken to pasture”36, and “Healthy cows”38; examples of adverts are: “Extra care for the animals in organic production”37, “Brogotffabriken” (Butterfactory)38, and “Taken to pasture”39.

The objective of these campaigns is to promote the added value of using Swedish milk and dairy products primarily with the idea that it is produced with good animal welfare, but also with concern for the environment. The messages from the Swedish dairy association are that Swedish farmers work hard to make Sweden the best country in the world for cows, pastures are good for cows, and Swedish cows are healthy and well taken care of. The adverts from the dairies mainly focus on cows taken to pasture and how Swedish farmers care for their animals since pastures are very important for consumer trust in Sweden and because Swedish law requires that all cows in Sweden be taken to pasture.

THE NETHERLANDS

In the Netherlands, growing societal concern about animal welfare, in particular regarding animal husbandry, has led farmers and agricultural organisations to pay more attention to the issue and has resulted in the mandatory requirement to learn specific skills.

Educational programmes on animal welfare are part of vocational training programmes but no common strategy on how to approach the issue has been developed, so each school and each

---

38 http://www.svenskandiakt.nl/aktuellt/bobarttuklaa/nansutentum-mustala-yravara-for-sima-loja/
34 http://www.svenskandiakt.nl/aktuellt/bobarttuklaa/nansutentum-mustala-yravara-for-sima-loja/
36 http://www.svenskandiakt.nl/aktuellt/bobarttuklaa/nansutentum-mustala-yravara-for-sima-loja/
37 http://www.svenskandiakt.nl/aktuellt/bobarttuklaa/nansutentum-mustala-yravara-for-sima-loja/
39 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c_EzQfFqz_Y
40 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c_EzQfFqz_Y
41 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c_EzQfFqz_Y
42 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c_EzQfFqz_Y
teacher determines their own criteria for the most part. However, a taskforce is currently preparing such a strategy, and the Dutch Farmers’ Organisation is supporting this initiative.

In the Netherlands, several awareness campaigns on animal welfare are in place at farm level, and these initiatives are often related to animal health issues or specific legislation.

**Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public**

As far as the general public is concerned, many public campaigns have been promoted. Several of them have been carried out by NGOs, mainly devoted to the protection of animal welfare such as:

1. “Dierenbescherming”[^49] – introduces a hallmark for products that come from farms with better conditions for animal welfare, since more and more animal products in supermarkets are distinguishing the level of animal welfare during farm production[^41].

2. “Walkie Dier”[^52] – very ‘aggressive’ in influencing public opinion, with adverts such as the “plofkip” campaign against regular broilers.

On the other hand, there are companies and supermarkets that promote their animal welfare-friendly products, often using the label “Dierenbescherming”.

Lastly, the Dutch government is also involved in regular campaigns to raise public awareness on animal welfare, often combined with other policy areas related to sustainable production[^43].

---

### UNITED KINGDOM

No particular qualifications are needed to start working on a farm in the United Kingdom but first-hand experience, usually gained through work experience or voluntary weekend work, is positively valued by employers.

Nevertheless, common entry routes into the farming and breeding industry include taking an apprenticeship where the learner develops the necessary skills through employment, or acquiring relevant vocational qualifications through college or private training providers. Agricultural colleges also offer a range of full-time, part-time and flexible learning for pre-entry foundation degrees and postgraduate programmes.

For farm managers, the normal route into this career is to start work as an assistant manager or as the manager of a single production unit. Some practical work experience is necessary prior to this stage. Although there are no formal requirements, most farm managers have a qualification in agriculture or a related subject and usually several years’ practical experience. Increasingly, agriculture is a popular option for those attending college and university, and animal welfare competencies would obviously form part of such a course on livestock management.

There are no educational or vocational programmes in the United Kingdom that farmers have to attend, however different sectors of the industry have developed their own programmes to respond to either farmers’ or regulatory needs. In the poultry sector, for example, the Poultry Meat Training Initiative was established by the industry to meet the requirements of the Red Tractor Assurance scheme and the Broiler Welfare Directive; this initiative sets minimum training requirements across the agricultural activities within the poultry meat industry and ensures that course content is standardised with a set minimum subject matter. A key part of

[^49]: [www.dierenbescherming.nl](http://www.dierenbescherming.nl)
[^41]: [http://beterd Leon.dierenbescherming.nl/#over-het-kennest](http://beterdLeon.dierenbescherming.nl/#over-het-kennest)
[^52]: [www.walkiedier.nl](http://www.walkiedier.nl)
this scheme is the ‘Poultry Passport’ which is an online system for recording staff training that has 4,500 members. Poultry Passports are broadly divided into four levels: Level 1 for trainees, level 2 for stockmen, level 3 for managers and level 4 for area managers/fieldmen. A trainee can expect to receive training in health and safety, biosecurity and poultry welfare, as well as a course on manual handling. These are also present in level 2 for stockmen, and this level also includes a level 2 diploma in work-based agriculture. Those at level 3 work towards attaining a level 3 diploma and attend short courses in first aid and the IPPC regulations.\(^4\)

The United Kingdom actively monitors farmers’ and breeders’ skills through several ad hoc schemes. Those working in the pig sector can register their staff and participate in relevant, demand-led development courses. The Pig Industry Professional Register (PIPR) was developed by the industry through BPEX (a statutory levy board) and aims to build the existing skills of the current workforce and help to attract new people to the industry. It aims to promote an improved, professional image of the pig industry, recognise experience and practical skills in addition to formal training, establish an independent record of skills amongst its members, and promote a clearer image of personal development. Members of the scheme must commit to keep themselves up to date and constantly review their practices and procedures in the light of progress and knowledge. A record of the activities and progress of each member is kept independently by City and Guilds Land Based Services, which organises the training. The scheme is voluntary and self-financed. Each member of the scheme is required to obtain a minimum of 50 points during a three-year term of membership. Each type of training carries a certain amount of Continuing Professional Development (CPD) points. These activities can include external training events, veterinary meetings, open meetings, technical conferences, industry-related events, subscription to technical journals, achieving a qualification, or attending specialist shows and trade fairs. The Pig Industry Professional Register is financed through rural development programmes (around 70%), and the remaining part is funded through BPEX. Farmers also pay to complete training courses through private training providers.

In addition to the Pig Industry Professional Register, the UK pig industry has also introduced the Red Welfare initiative which is part of the Red Tractor farm assurance scheme and the BPEX Pig Health Scheme (BHPS).

Red Welfare is an objective, science-based method of assessing the pigs welfare and not their pen or environment via observation and recording of iceberg indicators defined by academics. A proportion of pigs are assessed on each Red Tractor assured farm by a vet or a quarterly basis. The results are subsequently benchmarked against the rest of the industry and are used to identify areas for improvement with regards to pig welfare and to trigger discussion and engagement between vets and producers.

The BHPS scheme uses specialist pig veterinarians to assess a range of health conditions in pig carcasses slaughtered in abattoirs throughout Britain. This information is used by the producer in conjunction with the vet to help inform treatment and management protocols on farm and ultimately improve herd health.

Red Tractor Assurance also requires that producers and their stockmen have received formal training and assessment to demonstrate competency when conducting euthanasia, training is provided by a vet or a suitably trained and experienced person.

As described above, the British Poultry Training Initiative was developed in response to farm assurance training requirements and the EU Broiler Welfare Directive, which included requirements for training and certification. A working group was established to develop the initiative including the NFU, Lantra, the British Poultry Council and the independent poultry training specialists Poultex. The initiative has established minimal training requirements for each role within the industry. To record details of training to meet these requirements each person enrolled in the scheme has a Poultry Passport which is a secure, online training recording system. A number of organisations around the country offer training which meets the industry standard including Poultex, Minister Veterinary practices, Scottish Agricultural College and NFU Mutual Risk Management Services. Courses are accredited through Lantra awards and

\(^4\) http://www.poultrypassport.org/
the City and Guilds Land Based Services. An individual’s training is logged onto their Poultry Passport. Individuals have instant access to their training records, which are updated on their behalf on a continual basis. Reports can be generated identifying gaps in training and where refresher training is required.

The levy board in the UK for beef and lamb producers, EBLEX, runs the “Better Returns Programme”, which is designed to improve profitability through practical improvements on farms such as better feeding, condition scoring and a focus on welfare-friendly practices. AHDB, also a statutory levy board, has also run an EBLEX Better Returns programme for beef and sheep farmers. Figures from EBLEX show that 21,000 farmers have voluntarily signed up to receive information on the Better Returns programme. In the 2011/12 financial year the Better Returns programme ran 267 events attended by 6,757 producers. Some elements of the EBLEX Better Returns programme are financed with rural development funding 16.

A dairy CPD scheme was launched in September 2012. The scheme has been developed over the past two years – originating from the NFU Next Generation Dairy Board, which identified training and skills as being vital to the future of the British Dairy Industry. In recognising that there are various ways in which training can be conducted, they felt it was important for there to be a uniform method of recording and measuring skill development. This work has since been taken over by the statutory levy board – Dairy Co – which secured funding in 2011 to develop a CPD programme to identify and improve skills in this sector. An industry steering group was established to advance this. The scheme has three levels of membership – dairy farmer, associate and student. The dairy farmer members will need to collect 40 points over a two-year period. Membership is confirmation that a dairy worker shows a commitment to on-going and personal training and development. The scheme is monitored by BASIS. Dairy farmers can collect points at any meeting, seminar, conference, and training course or show they attend, as well as on literature and websites they read that carry the Dairy Pro logo 17.

The main reason for which farmers attend training courses is predominantly the need to comply with legal requirements. However, they are also very interested in refreshing their knowledge, while improving farm performance, by taking advantage of networking with other farmers on good practices. At the same time, they are also motivated by personal development and CPD points, and the desire to demonstrate their competence or professionalism to stakeholders (consumer, retailers, inspectors, assurance bodies, etc.). Time constraints, together with a lack of help on the farm while the farmer is away, pose a great limitation. At the same time, low correspondence of the training courses to the farmers’ specific needs, logistic issues (distance, lack of transport, etc.), lack of formal training plans or training budgets, low priority accorded to the issue of skill development, high costs of training, and an unclear understanding of the educational system’s mechanism are all deterrents to participation in the courses.

Several awareness campaigns on animal health welfare are organised in the UK (mainly focused on the dairy sector). The Dairy Cow Welfare Strategy was launched in 2000 and has been reviewed every year since. Its main objectives are to raise the standard of welfare for all dairy cows and reduce the welfare impacts of endemic diseases; to establish a standard set of welfare priorities to guide future policy development, research and on-farm improvement initiatives; to set welfare goals and identify industry responsibility for improving dairy cow welfare; to promote recognition and acceptance of the fact that welfare is dependent on the quality and standard of husbandry and stockmanship in any system; and to generate greater consumer awareness and understanding of welfare standards to ensure a continued positive public perception of dairy cow welfare in Britain. The strategy covers issues such as lameness, mastitis, eradicating endemic diseases and BVD. A range of industry stakeholders are involved in the strategy, including the levy boards, and farmers are encouraged to participate in rural development initiatives on welfare, with their milk buyers or directly with levy boards. Progress is reviewed annually.

Furthermore, the ‘Stamp Out Lameness’ campaigns is a recent campaign from the agricultural publication ‘Farmers Weekly’ that involved magazine articles and internet discussion boards on

16 http://www.eblex.org.uk/returns/
17 http://www.dairyco.co.uk/
lameness in sheep, how to treat it, and how to improve animal welfare. This was a joint effort between industry groups, drug companies and a retailer. Additionally, many dairy companies in the UK work with their supplying producers on animal health and animal welfare campaigns to improve cow health and welfare on the farm. This is increasingly linked to contracts and the price of milk.

Activities to promote the welfare of farm animals amongst the general public

In the UK several awareness raising activities have been promoted to educate the general public on animal welfare: Red Tractor Farm Assurance promotes animal welfare standards and has a website addressed to the general public; DairyCo, the dairy industry levy board for the UK, manages a website called “This is Dairy Farming”, which tells the story of dairy farming in general, but with a real focus on the welfare and health of dairy cows on the farm; in the pig sector a recent campaign specifically on the prices run by the industry levy board BPESX highlights the welfare standards of UK pork in an effort to boost sales and consumption. The campaigns described are usually internet based, with a further focus on print media and public advertising.

Specific campaigns on welfare are usually led by the statutory levy boards with support from industry stakeholders such as farmers' organisations.
Appendix 14: Interview to the manager of Anprogapor

1. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare training activities for farmers, vets, transporters, slaughter personnel, etc, in the EU?

If you think the situation is different for different groups, please specify. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify. Please indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses.

They really have an advantage, they get all this information about animal welfare, but have they really embraced it, are they really familiar with it? I think it could be improved by using a nearer language, closer the farmers so that they are able to draw something from these courses, able to relate it with their daily productivity.

At the start, some courses are too general, not focused on anything or any species in particular, so they don’t bother too much. If these courses are turned into something more specific, then they would be more receptive, since they would see clearly the objective and the benefit from the beginning. So the key is the approach. It should be focused in a way that is made interesting for them, showing what they can win from it; courses they apply to because they have interest on the specific topic, stress the benefits animal welfare provides to livestock; i.e. pass on the idea that sows reared in groups do produce more, or that productive numbers for pigs in the 21st century can be improved with improved handling.

To work on case studies; make comparative analysis that allow following how it really works.

In Spain we are exporters, but we do not export quality meat, just meat. In pigs, the benefit animal welfare provides is better during the production phase than during labelling.

Also farmers and producers should have a social recognition, a built reputation, for their job, for what they do and for doing it correctly/right.

2. What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare training activities for professionals working with animals: farmers, veterinarians, transporters, slaughterhouse personnel, etc...?

If you think the situation is different for different groups, please specify. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify.

I would organize trainings ad hoc for different regions, different systems, etc. I would complement animal welfare issues with other relevant topics.

All these measures imply having a pyramid of trainers, a training consultancy system, although it is yet no clear whether it should be a private company or not.

We keep on with the compulsory courses, but promoting also a series of voluntary courses, to ensure they all have a minimum knowledge. Payed quality trainings offered by professionals.

3. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU?

Indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses (i.e. agree/disagree on who should or shouldn’t be in charge of these activities)

I think there’s not much material nor initiatives about this to educate students, and what gets to them is very light. I.e. the Farmland project, I don’t like it. It should be focused on how much progress has been done and what’s the current situation on animal welfare, but with a more real vision of the situation. We should start by asking “what do you think animal welfare is?”, and then from here we could start educating/informing at different levels, different ways and strategies;
4. What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU?

If you think the situation is different for different groups, please specify. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify.

Regarding children, I think we have to bring animals closer to them. Regarding secondary school students, show them the importance of including meat in a balanced diet. And regarding graduate students, I would address issues like food safety, social aspects of animal production, quality of products, waste management, etc. This education should be under professional’s responsibility, who could visit the schools and colleges to provide direct information to all pupils.

Also teachers should be trained, but we would need to provide an incentive to ensure the quality of these trainings, i.e. paying them some extra 200 € for attending these trainings, or funding the “production week” at secondary schools, so that teachers could be educated. Farmland is not realistic and therefore it can be misleading or get to confusion. Family farms are a good idea, but bearing in mind that the real concept of “farming” should always be behind.

We have to stress the idea that farm animals are the sustenance for a family (social aspect). The fact that this type of education is currently performed by the NGOs, makes the information to be biased, directed quite often against meat consumption.

There should be a regulation at EU level, to monitor which information is provided and which is not, such as i.e the origin of meat, to know where they come from or to go deeper in the concept of being sympathetic, in the fact that everyone can have access to meat in a current situation in which world population is increasing.

5. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU?

If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify. Indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses.

There’s not enough information arriving to the general public. Media tends to show more the lack of welfare than the welfare itself. There’s a huge competence between all different media and in this case sensationalism is more attractive and gets more to people.

6. What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU?

There should be more access to show positive images, but that feeling does not exist. Also, the role of companies in labelling is not clear yet. There’s very little control from the farmers side and then the industrial side.

Another difficult aspect is whether the consumer accepts so much information or not; to put this information in the fresh meat is easier than in the manufactured product. This should guarantee an added value, and if it’s voluntary, there should be clear rules for those who decide to take part in the game. And also we have to take into account that labelling food products at different levels is quite complicated, since animal welfare is for the public a matter of just black or white.
Appendix 15: FVE

To include as much views as possible in the study, we contacted with the Federation of Veterinarians of Europe (FVE), as well as other organisations, to ask you your opinion on different aspects and take into consideration this information in the final report. The opinion of FVE will be used in the discussion and included in the annexes, without any change, in the final report if you are agree. The questions that you could address, would be:

1. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare training activities for farmers, veterinaries, transporters, slaughter personnel, etc, in the EU? If you think the situation is different per different groups, please specify it. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify it. Indicate if you want strengths and weaknesses.

“Veterinarians are, and must continually strive to be, the leading advocates for the good welfare of animals in a continually evolving society”.

Welfare science is a dynamic and multi-disciplinary subject; including the study of the mental and physical health of animals, as well as its ethical implications in relation to humans, the environment and regulation. The FVE strategy for 2011-2015 states that veterinarians have a professional and ethical responsibility to use their scientific knowledge and skills for the benefit of animal welfare. All veterinarians should be able to educate, inform and influence animal owners, caretakers, handlers and policy makers to protect and improve animal welfare. Welfare (and its associated research) is, therefore, seen as an important aim in veterinary education along with other key subjects such as animal health and public health.

Focusing on the training of veterinarians, it is possible to distinguish several different mechanisms of animal welfare education available for veterinarians.

For official veterinarians, Member States are the main responsible authorities to ensure official veterinarians employed are well educated and trained on animal welfare. Therefore, the education provided depends very much on the Member State and as a result, disparities can occur.

As reported by the Food and Veterinary Office of the European Commission, in some Member States the lack of training is existent. Also, appropriate welfare training is also missing for officials veterinarians in certain fields where specialists’ expertise is crucially needed (for instance, zoos inspections).

In addition, training is available via the European Commission’s initiative ‘Better Training for Safer Food’.

However, the number of welfare training sessions is limited leading to having only a couple of persons per country trained each year.

As these are the leading workshops, it seems essential to know if or how follow-up trainings are carried out in the different Member States.

Some online-based programmes and resources have also been developed for official veterinarians, notably by the IZSAM G. Caporale Teramo; it would be opportune to evaluate their concrete impact.

Regarding private veterinary practitioners, the European Commission and FVE have put together animal welfare workshops. Six of them have already been organised covering six different countries (Hungary, Italy, Latvia, Romania, Spain, The Netherlands) and providing training for approximately 800 veterinarians of which about 500 practitioners and 300 official veterinarians.

Four more workshops are being planned in the coming two years. In 2014, two animal workshops will be held in Warsaw, Poland on 10-12 April and Lyon, France while the two remaining ones will take place in 2015 in Bulgaria and Greece.

Furthermore, universities, schools, or institutes offer private training often in relation to animal health (e.g. on a certain identified disease). Animal welfare can be included as an aspect of the training but is rarely approached as a full perspective.

---

51 http://ec.europa.eu/eahc/food/
52 http://www.izs.it/IZS/Engine/RAServePG.php?P?250010010303L/1
In deed, in many countries, veterinarians need to follow mandatory continuing professional development (CPD) in order to keep their license valid. Some private veterinarians are also handed out official tasks, mostly in the field of disease control but sometimes with welfare aspects embedded. The question is whether in all countries the training is provided by the competent authority or not. In any case, we believe it should be recommended. Concerning veterinarians working in the laboratory field, specialised education and training courses are made available, notably by the Federation of European Laboratory Animal Science Associations (FELASA)\(^53\), in order to become a ‘designated veterinarian’. At specialists’ level, the European College of Animal Welfare and Behavioural Medicine (ECAWBM)\(^54\) has been established under the European Board of Veterinary Specialisation (EBVS), strives to provide veterinarians specialised in animal welfare and behavioural medicine through qualified European specialists.

2. **Which you think should be the policy on animal welfare training activities for professionals working with animals: farmers, veterinarians, transporters, slaughter personnel, etc... If you think the situation is different per different groups, please specify it. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify it.**

In order to be effective for professionals, training and daily practice should benefit from a conjoint approach. When feasible and appropriate, FVE believes training should be combined for veterinarians, farmers, transports, slaughter personnel, etc. However, it is essential to take into careful consideration the specific technical needs for each professional group involved with animals. In that perspective, combined training can be difficult to apply. The European Union should pursue its current effort focused on training by:

- Keeping on encouraging the Member States to provide appropriate training for professionnals involved with animals.
- Ensuring appropriate training is provided by Member States by conducting controls.
- Harmonising as much as possible the training available in the different Member States; for instance, as laid down in Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations.

Also, it is very likely, basic knowledge from farmers and operators in terms of animal health and disease control will be required by the Regulation on Animal Health. As such, not including some behavioural, husbandry and welfare aspects in the required training would be missing on an opportunity. The Member States would still remain responsible, the European Union could put together guidelines in which should be included a sort of minimum curriculum and Day-1 competences, as promoted by FVE.

3. **What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU? Indicate if you want strengths and weaknesses (i.e. agree in who is in charge of this activities or not)**

At the moment, animal welfare education does not seem to be taught to secondary school and university students not following courses in direct relation with animal and biological sciences or agriculture.

4. **Which you think should be the policy on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU? If you think the situation is different per different groups, please specify it. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify it.**


\(^54\) [http://www.ecawbm.com/](http://www.ecawbm.com/)
Given that primary schools students are more open receptive, basic animal welfare training should be integrated in the mandatory curriculum of all primary school pupils (six to twelve years old). For example, Austria has already incorporated such training in its education system. Education is once again a competence of the Member States, in that perspective it should be recommended to all Ministers in charge of education. The European Union is to play a key role in encouraging and facilitating the implementation via guidelines, model handbooks (e.g. Tierschutz macht Schule)\textsuperscript{55}, games (e.g. Farmland)\textsuperscript{56} and other initiatives.

Regarding secondary school students and university students - not in direct relation with animals or biological sciences - the benefit of mandatorily including animal welfare training, does not seem obvious. Nonetheless, it is important to make it available for the students eager to study this academic subject. For instance, in law studies, animal welfare law is available as an optional course in very few European universities;\textsuperscript{57} it should be fully promoted as an elective and offered by tracking.

5. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU? If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify it. Indicate if you want strengths and weaknesses.

In terms of information and communication activities for the broad public and consumers, the European Union has demonstrated great efforts and proven successes. However, we also feel that a lot more needs to be achieved.

Our society becomes more and more alienated about the way animals are reared, transported and slaughtered and where our food comes from. Companion animals and the ones used for entertainment purposes are the only animals people still relate to. Even so, some persons do not have contact with these animals anymore. In that sense, the meat industry does very much its best to cut as much as possible the link between meat, as a final product, and animals as producers, leading to a misconception about how animals should be kept and how they actually are.

6. Which you think should be the policy on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU?

All actors should focus their energy on bringing back society closer to what is actually animal production. This conjoint effort could be successfully carried out by introducing more transparency about the farming systems, putting together initiatives such as open days on farms, slaughterhouses and promoting images reflecting the reality behind the products.

The European Union shall continue to try to take leadership in doing so, and having all the other actors involved for assistance. Labelling of products plays also an important role in animal welfare and empowering the consumers. Special attention should be paid to young children as they are very receptive to the message and act as catalysts to the rest of the society.

\textsuperscript{55} http://www.tierschutzmachtschule.at
\textsuperscript{56} http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/farmland/index_en.htm
\textsuperscript{57} Notably at the Autonomous University of Barcelona, Faculty of Law
Appendix 16: ECAWBM

Please note that we are the ECAWBM and the sub-speciality of AWSEL (Animal Welfare Science, Ethics and Law).

To include as much views as possible in the study, we contacted with ECAWBM, as well as other organisations, to ask you your opinion on different aspects and take into consideration this information in the final report. The opinion of ECAWBM will be used in the discussion and included in the annexes, without any change, in the final report if you are agree.

We agree to this

The questions that you could address, would be:

1. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare training activities for farmers, veterinaries, transporters, slaughter personnel, etc, in the EU? If you think the situation is different per different groups, please specify it. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify it. Indicate if you want strengths and weaknesses.

The situation should be improved for all animal keepers as well as those who use animals should have more formal qualifications. Any education should have a basic course in the recognition of animal pain and distress and then that should be tailored to the enterprise or job that the person is involved in.

2. Which you think should be the policy on animal welfare training activities for professionals working with animals: farmers, veterinarians, transporters, slaughter personnel, etc... If you think the situation is different per different groups, please specify it. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify it.

See Q 2

3. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU? Indicate if you want strengths and weaknesses (i.e. agree in who is in charge of this activities or not)

There is very little I suspect, and not even in the biosciences.

4. Which you think should be the policy on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU? If you think the situation is different per different groups, please specify it. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify it.

Any education should have a basic course in the recognition of animal pain and distress and then that should be tailored to the enterprise or job that the person is involved in.

5. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU? If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify it. Indicate if you want strengths and weaknesses.

It relies often on the animal protection movement and not governments although some do have relevant websites.

6. Which you think should be the policy on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU?

This might come in through welfare labelling of food and feed.
Appendix 17: Interview with the coordinator of the Master’s Degree in “Animal Law and Society” of the University Autonomous of Barcelona (UAB)

The information was obtained by means of a face to face interview with Dr. Teresa Giménez-Candela, coordinator of the Master “Animal Law and Society” of the UAB and editor of the webpage “animal rights”.68

Since year 2006, the Faculty of Law of the UAB (University of Barcelona, Spain) has included an optional subject on law and animal welfare in the curriculum. This subject was also addressed by students from other faculties (63 students in total) until year 2009, before Bologna Process; but since then only students from the Faculty of Law (43 students in the last master) can attend the subject. Nowadays, it is the only faculty in Europe that has included this program in the official curriculum. To fulfil the Master, students need to present a master thesis. Each year 5 of these theses are hold for questions related to Law and Animal Welfare, although it has been extended to 8 in the last year due to the increased demand. There are agreements with universities from other countries, i.e. each year French students under the Joint Law Program with Sorbonne University, develop their master thesis in the UAB on this subject. In the last year 3 of these theses received an official recognition from the faculty for their high quality.

The degree on Animal Law and Society (for the moment unique in Europe) was created in 2009. It is divided in two modules and opened to everybody, including students with elementary studies. Lectures normally start in October until June, two days a week, including additional workshops and visits to collaborating entities. The first two months are intensively dedicated to the principles of Law. At the end of the course students receive a diploma and the access to the Master’s degree on Animal Law and Society divided in two additional modules. The course includes a period of practices at the end of the lectures with different type of collaborators, such as official competent authorities, universities from Europe, South-America and USA, and NGO's such as CIWF or Eurogroup for animals. For accessing the master’s degree, the requirement is to be in possession of a degree or diploma, (preferably in Law, Humanities, Philosophy, Veterinary Medicine, History, Communication Science, Biology, Environmental Science, Education). Students come from America, Africa and Europe and the number of vacant is 15-20. Students have to carry out a final master thesis that should be defended by a committee in a public session. After the master, students have wide access to jobs related with the subject, i.e. one of the students created the first lawyer’s office specialized in Animal Law in Spain, and another student became the director of the Model Animal Rescue Centre in Vienna. Students can continue the study with a PhD of 4 ongoing years. In January 2015, an online version of this master will be launched. The tutors of the course are experts around the world with a wide variety of profiles, such as researchers on animal welfare, law experts, members of public bodies, etc.

Furthermore, in 2009, the group created the webpage, with the most important European database on Animal Law.69 A newsletter is published once a month with information on aspects related with animals in relation to Law, e.g. cases of abuse, custody of pets in case of divorce, etc... This work is developed by a huge number of volunteers, although all the material is reviewed by an editorial board before being published. They count on collaborators (legal reporters) all around the world, and when requested, specific questions are created to address special topics, such as i.e. when the new law about housing conditions for laying hens had to be implemented.

Other activities of the group include the edition of specific books about Animal Law (3 edited so far), the organization of workshops with old students of the master invited to explain their experiences, and the organization of the second congress on animal welfare and legislation (this last summer and 10 years after the first).60

---

68 http://www.derechoanimal.info/eng/home/Index
69 www.derechoanimal.info
60 Video: http://www.derechoanimal.info/eng/page/3381/journal-i-global-animal-law-conference
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When Dr. Teresa Giménez-Candela was asked about her opinion on how the question of the animal welfare at schools should be addressed, she highlighted the need to integrate this as part of the education at all levels. A key question is to incentivize the empathy towards the animals (forbidding practices with animals at the school) and introducing the topic as part of the respect that should be a must in the society. The first step is to teach the teachers, by means of summer schools and campus in a harmonized way. It would be necessary to elaborate teaching materials for this purpose. For instance, there are good materials from the Animal Legal Defense Fund for high school students (they should know something about legislation), and from the International Humane Society for younger students (more oriented to attitudes), but these materials should be harmonized into and between countries. The role of the NGO's is important and must be important, some kind of official monitoring would be necessary for the harmonization of these contents. It would also be important for all the students to experience direct contact with the animals through farm visits, but real farms, where animal's needs could be explained in situ.

In relation to consumers and public in general, the first step is to define a labeling system for food products of animal origin, avoiding ambiguous or biased messages. A good example of how to get to citizens could be the campaigns related traffic regulations that according to Dr. Giménez-Candela are very present in the mass media with specific and well-developed informative campaigns. However, the message must be positive and based in a good labeling system controlled by public bodies to ensure that the information provided is clear and correct. Consumers associations have also a very important role in this, so they should be involved in the process. Campaigns should be something integrated, without dilemmas or controversies, just considering this aspect as part of a responsible consumption, as the question of sustainability is seen nowadays.
Appendix 18: Interview with the chairman of animal welfare in the University of Cádiz

The information was obtained through a face to face interview with Dr. J.M. Pérez Monguíó, Professor of animal welfare in the University of Cádiz. This professorship is a common initiative of the official schools of veterinarians and the Law Faculty in Cádiz. In his words “the main objective is to facilitate the progress in the knowledge and conciliation of the welfare of production animals with that of the citizenship and to promote the role of veterinarians as the most skilled professionals to link the health and the welfare of animals with that of the citizens”.

The objective of this interview was to be able to share the experience and the different perspectives of the interviewer, with wide experience and a key role in this matter, and to be able to draw some strategies, good practices and proposals that could be used in the future.

The interview addressed several issues of interest for the project and the main ideas and proposals made by Dr. Monguíó regarding current education on animal welfare of three main stakeholders (children/secondary school students, general public and professionals) are presented next;

Education in primary and secondary school
To educate children, firstly it is needed to educate the teachers in the subject of animal welfare, and provide them with skills and competences. To achieve this, the professorship is working on a pilot project to facilitate the education in animal welfare to these professionals. The objective is to organize voluntary activities with students of the Faculty of Education on the subject of animal welfare. The idea is to educate them, not to convince them. In this way the students can form their own concepts and then work to design and develop their own version of the subject to be implemented. The students elaborate teaching material and afterwards they go to several schools to present their educational program. In this way, the future teachers will have certain knowledge about animal welfare, so it is ensured that they will be capable of teaching others.

It is necessary to address the relationship of humans and animals at schools, to teach about the evolution of animals all through the story and mythology, and to transmit that animals are sentient beings with cognitive, sensorial and communicative abilities, but without losing the perspective that they are animals, and this not good, not bad, it’s just an objective fact, and it’s the way it should be approached.

The group has performed seminars and talks in 400 schools of Andalusia, for 10 and 11 years old children, we decided to start with those ages because younger children would probably need a previous training or introduction.

Dr. Pérez Monguíó defends that animal welfare should be included in the program of the elementary education. For this purpose, a change in the whole educational model is required, as well as a change in the perception of the environment, of which animal welfare is an inherent part.

Education and information towards the general public
Dr. J.M. Pérez Monguíó has experience with different type of audiences (general public, farmers, lawyers, etc), and the approach is very different depending on the group. In general, there is a huge lack of knowledge; consumers don’t want to know much about animal welfare, they feel judged and “ashamed” to be co-responsible of what happens with animals in the production system. He thinks that the whole matter of animal welfare is not a disaster nowadays, it was many years ago, but not now. It’s been a huge evolution since in the last decades.

To contribute to the progress of animal welfare, consumers need to be educated and informed. The change is in mentality, and this does not happen if there is a demand of low quality animal protein every day. It’s necessary to work to change consumers’ habits. This will enforce a restructuring of the sector and could mean therefore an improvement in consumers’ health and in the environment.

Media is the current way of “transgression”. It is effective at transmitting and also has a huge impact. However, TV leaves a weak tail that lasts only for 2 or 3 days. Publicity and advertisements are faking,
they don’t show the reality, and so these cannot be used as means for informing or educating. All communication media should be able to define unique criteria and strategy for communication in relation to this matter; they should become to an agreement and define a protocol of action, so that homogeneous messages in relation to animal welfare are provided.
Initiatives on the radio do work well, although with less impact, since our society is more visual, they choose images rather than audio, so we need to take this into account.

**Education of professionals**

In Spain the situation can be split into two groups; the veteran and the young professionals. The first group suggests that “things have always been done that way” and are very reticent to changes, and the latter, among whom common sense is increasing. This is a kind of “cultural transmission spread mouth to mouth”, and it’s very difficult to fight off.

In his opinion, there is nothing stipulated about the subject of animal welfare, not even in degrees that are as specific and related to this as veterinary Science. However, at this point the reporters want to mention that all the veterinary schools in the EU have lectures in animal welfare as subject by itself or into another subject. So, Dr. J.M. Pérez Monguíó is probably talking about the lack of a specific subject addressing only animal welfare issues (including ethic and law aspects) for veterinaries in Spain.

Most of the times, farmers and producers do not want to know about animal welfare, either, because all the initiatives cost them money, and they don’t get funding from the government or from any entity.

Education for professionals working with animals should be more rigorous, especially of to that targeted to farmers and other professionals working with farm animals. It should be taken seriously by the competent authorities, at national and regional level, especially to avoid frauds and to ensure the education and trainings are of high quality and provided by the appropriate educators.

The proposal to create a European educational centre for animal welfare has been considered for a long time, so state or regional centres for the education of professionals could be under the umbrella of the European one, with homogeneous criteria for education, methodology and assessment on animal welfare, but different levels for implementation.

Thinking on the future, the current demand and the increase importance of animal welfare in Europe, may facilitate the implementation of a degree on animal welfare at the University. It’s also possible to include this subject in other degrees for which it is relevant; i.e. in Law. He promoted the initiative to include animal welfare in the compulsory courses that students have to attend, so now lawyers in the province of Cádiz have to attend 10 hours of professional practice, 2 hours of animal welfare concept and 8 hours of theory from a chosen topic. He is also working on the elaboration of guidelines for farmers, focused on legislation and handling practices. The purpose is to distribute this document together with an educational plan, so it could be handled as continuous training at national level.
Appendix 19: Interviews with journalists of the agro-food sector

Interview with J.A. Castelló (Director of the real poultry academy in Spain)

I. Some comments about the questionnaire:
Some questions seem too general to him. It is very difficult to answer encompassing all species together.

People's assessments and perceptions are very different depending on whether it is about species that are reared in intensive or extensive conditions. In general terms in a ranking of 20, the concern about animal welfare would occupy a position between 15 to 20. Although few people would affirm in public that this is not really a topic of their concern, data from consumption indicates that the average consumption is about 80kg of meat per capita and data from 2013 indicates that the most consumed meats are first chicken (33%), and second pigs (30%); species that are reared in intensive conditions in 90%.

So it is really consumer behaviour what reflects their real concern, and recent studies indicate that the main concerns of today's consumer are: price, brand, quality, etc.

II. J.A. CASTELLÓ, what have your experiences been like as a communicator
He has published 12 books of poultry and participated in countless conferences on various topics related to the sector, mainly related to economic aspects of poultry farming in Europe, New Zealand, Chile, Mexico, etc. His communications were mainly directed to professionals. In occasions he has given seminars and lectures at the University, to a non professional audience.

He has participated in meetings at European level before 1999, when the new regulation for the welfare of laying hens was published. He had already anticipated to what might come and share his concern for the issue of welfare, though always linked to economic aspects.

As a professional coming from the industry, he has extensive experience in the production of foie gras, a French national product highly valued

- When you have to give the news, how do you do it? How do you approach the public?
I speak about the reality, telling the truth. Talking about chicken production, about the 5 freedoms, knowing that probably the least implemented is that about the space, but even though people need to know the truth. For example, the law states that for ecological hens the extension must be 4m² / hen, and in my experience I can tell that that's not necessary. It has been observed that in this much space (and draws a space cheese shaped), if we observe the hens at different times of the day, they are always here (and points at the apex of the cheese), and further from that side, is almost empty. Hens do not have that exploratory need, so they never cover the entire field, so that amount of large space is not necessary.

For example; how would you deal with the following situation?
You have to give the following news:

a) "Spain has the best production of pigs in Europe"
b) "Slaughterhouses close in Spain due to problems with the cattle during unloading after transport"

You have to be very careful when communicating to a non professional audience to avoid wrong interpretations. You have to put yourself at the same level of the audience.

What basic rules of communication must always be met? Words that should or should not be used, what kind of language? So should we always look for the greatest impact?
As I said, we have to tell the truth, explain how things are really done in poultry, showing that there is a real concern, that's all. You can "soften" your message, but never distort it.

- Images, pictures: what are the criteria?
Sometimes taken out of context and distorted images are published, and they are detrimental for the production sector. I can think of many examples of fraudulent images, so you have to explain that they distort the real image of the productive sector.

For example, the issue about duck production; they are migratory, and thus have the natural ease to accumulate fat in the liver. We took advantage of this for ourselves, and force the feeding to get a fatty liver. But this is only during the last 15 days of life, the rest of the time the animals live well. So if an isolated picture from a duck is taken at this stage, or immobilized up to the head, this can create a distorted picture of the entire sector.

III. General public. How to make the public trust in farmers and their techniques? How to bring these two figures closer? What strategies could be followed? Examples.

If UK citizens are asked about the production of eggs, they would mention:
1) Welfare of hens, 2) food security, 3) ... etc.

If we make this same question to citizens in Spain, where animal welfare is not a concern, they will say that 1) health, 2) price, 3) food safety, 4) ... etc.

All this is also reflected in other things; for example, in Spain 92% of chickens are reared in battery. In Portugal 93%. The European average is 57.6%, Spain is in the 25th position among the 27 members, although this average is mainly due to 8 countries, including;
- Switzerland: total ban on raising chickens in cages since 1982
- Austria: 3% caged
- Luxembourg: 0%
- Germany: 11%
- The Netherlands: 15.5%
- UK: 55%

UK for example has gone ahead of what legislation says, mainly due to citizen’s decision or pressure. Also due to the pressure made by large NGOs, groups or protective associations, which are a great driving force.

Perceptions in each country are very different, as they are closely linked to other things such as; social concerns, beliefs, habits, etc. For example; in the UK boxing is widely accepted and with many sport fans, but here in Spain is worst seen, and in other European countries people see it as something aggressive and reject it. It happens to goose breeding in France.

For the production of foie gras, the animal is subjected to forced feeding during the last 15 days of its life, so that its liver can accumulate enough fat. The law says that these animals must remain in collective cages, to foster social relationships and maintain their well-being, and I know that in Spain this is applied in a 70% of the farms, while in France, the percentage of compliance is less than 50%, even though they risk a lot more, because it’s a national product.

The whole context makes perceptions of what is cruel and what is not, to be very different. For example in the state of California the purchase of foie was banned, but only in that state.

What is the role of the media? Do they play the good or the bad?

In general the media is quite sensationalist, sometimes published things are too shocking, an example are the headlines. If we think of an infomercial, that a private company sends to our magazine, it has a very specific purpose, which is to promote or sell a product, so you have to be able to distinguish that. We indicated it in our magazine (and he shows me some examples).

Another example is the newspaper "The Case", a very gutter newspaper that would publish only cases of murder, robbery, rape, etc, and the goal was that, to cause the greatest impact on readers and attract them with sensationalism and morbidity.

So dealing with issues such as animal welfare, which is a sensitive issue nowadays, we must be careful and be aware of the impact that such communication may cause.
According to some preliminary results, most people get the information from the mass media such as TV and internet, and to a lesser extent on the radio. From your experience, what communication tools would be the best suited?

A pilot project to be put in place, funded by the EC, is intended to make a program on production systems and legislation; do you think this could work?

In general people read very little nowadays, the demand for newspapers has significantly decreased, they watch television much more and search on the internet, so this initiative could have a great impact, it's a huge media for dissemination. Also the radio, but television brings images that get much more to the public.

This program should be run by several figures; professionals, academics and members of the Administration to ensure that the audience perceives an impartial position.

This would be a good initiative to take the opportunity to talk about legislation, stressing that an important part of food security depends on the handling of food products, and at this stage the farmer cannot do anything. Also ensuring that the public does not believe that we do things that way just because it's required by the law, but because we want to ensure food safety, ensure food-quality and affordable products. The case of battery hens; farmers already bared for all these aspects prior to that, but they had made no changes due to economic reasons. But he was worried for them to be healthy well fed chickens, to avoid feather picking, and above they met the law.

From my point of view, the law on the welfare of laying hens is absurd, because it has meant billions of investment for the national production sector. Moreover, the producer knows that a good cared animal is directly linked to an increased improved production, and that that has an effect on their benefit.

What's currently in the media about BA and / or animal production?
There is little, practically only food news and other crises are published, and it is only in specialized journals.

What can we do for this information to get to the citizens? Tell them about what is already legislated in animal welfare?
Information is closely linked to education. The level of knowledge is linked to the educational base. This has improved a lot since my times, but more needs to be done.
In Spain for example, today there are more practical lectures, children are taken to the countryside, to the farms, there is a growing awareness. Also the books they use today bring the children closer to nature. This situation would improve a lot if we included these subjects in children’s’ education.

What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students in relation to this matter?
The Ministry of Agriculture, for example; today there is a better flow of information, back in the past it was formerly a political establishment, and there was an absolute divorce from society. Today the Administration is much closer, they explain a lot more. Ministers and councillors are now closer, this was unthinkable before. This closeness also favours a greater support, although their freedom is restricted by the European Union. But, could it be improved? Yes, of course. On this basis, their role in the European Union could be even stronger to stand for the interests of the sector.
For example, some time ago I read a child had been asked to draw a picture of a chicken, and the child drew a chicken on a tray, as we find it in the supermarket. Today this kind of things should not happen.
A regulation on education for all would be very difficult to implement, too controversial; linguistic, thematic, etc, I mean, there are things that are not debatable, but this issue would really be.
On the other hand, regarding the education of professionals, they have not always lived up to the circumstances; they have a duty of extension, of echo, and thus a greater responsibility.
What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare training activities for professionals? What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare training activities for professionals working with animals?

I think nowadays the majority of producers are educated people; today's professionals must follow a 20-hour course on animal welfare, which did not exist before, so they have more knowledge now. For example our school offers training courses on any aspects related to poultry. Germany is one of the leading producers of eggs with 50 million laying hens. There are demonstrations of environmentalists that say it is inhumane to kill these 50 million male chicks. My answer is that it is not economic; it would be totally unviable not to do this. I think it will be a dilemma in the future, but someone tell us what do we do with these chicks that are quickly slaughtered and used as feeding for falconry birds.

Slaughterhouses here in Catalonia could found no native staff, and they were forced to hire foreigners. Guissona i.e. cares for the teaching and training of their employees. In fact I cannot imagine that people not trained could do this, but I don’t know the percentage of these employees that have enough training, the truth is I don’t know. But I know producers themselves do usually have minimum technical training.

I think both, the one performing the slaughter, and the food handler should be well educated and have sufficient knowledge. This really should be regulated.

Interview with Pau Echauz (journalist of the agrofood sector in Catalonia)

* Relate to:
- Are they informed?
- In what ways do you consider that there is misinformation and / or confusion?
- What role does the media here?
- What could be the best strategy to inform the public? With what tools?

What have your experiences been like as a journalist/communicator?

He has published 12 He has 34 years of experience. He has worked as a journalist from 1975 to 1977 to 1982 in the local newspaper Segre. Lleida has much agricultural potential (swine Shack (first in Spain)). There are two important sectors that must report (agriculture and pork production). You have to know the calico production, business, labour, politics, everything. You have to know the big players in this sector.

Journalist receives many inputs has contacts. It starts at the Vanguardia *The Agricultural Exchange, the girl failed, he could do this, it was on agricultural markets. Every week talking about industries, products, almonds, pork, beef, etc. There are also players who send them information. (ASASA, Counselling, EU offices, etc.). It has a certain name and this favours increased inputs. The specialization will not seek, she looks like you. Since mankind, you will never sleep with you without learning something new. The radio show was born for this, to output many inputs. The end result was 17 lines.

UA1 Radio spoke with the director. The public hearing and is very local, but it is specialized. It is a difficult program to do, but still, try to listen at all. We try to be a generalist, but a general specialist (Lleida-Catalonia-Spain-EU).

The prime function of the MMCOOM is pedagogical. We try popularizing terms such as "Animal Welfare Standards", PAC, etc.

When you have to give the news, how do you do it? How do you approach the public?

Images, pictures: what are the criteria?

I like to explain all these things with a close language. It has sections that recall the livestock and agriculture have to do with the natural cycles of life, while capitalism it is charging.
Food is very important in a world that evolves towards overpopulation. We've industrialized everything possible. This sector should double its presence in the media. We are consumers, taxpayers.

- General public; what do you think is their perception on AW and/or animal production? Do you think they are informed?

The metropolitans want to have benefits, but away from them, so it doesn't interfere. Like the discredit for the water used for agricultural techniques, it's based on ignorance, an overall huge enormous ignorance. For example, the discussion about bulls, nothing would have been forbidden, bulls would have been left to die of starvation. They will complain, protest, but then a fillet of beef is eaten. But do not care or know if it is stunned, and as has been treated, etc.

- What's currently in the media about BA and / or animal production?
- What is the role of the media? Do they play the good or the bad?

The media and formal education do not pay enough attention to this. The English, for example, can be very cruel, they colonized here and there all throughout history, but then they are very caring with their kitty...

Half a century ago, subsistence farming consisted of a cow, a pig and a goat ... This changed with intensive farming, the concept is machined.

Some actions is being taken, but at the school level, and this is an impact that lasts for a day, and that doesn't work.

Some curiosity, some culture about the products is missing, we should not only know the products, but get to know about what we eat, where our food comes from.

Is it an uncomfortable topic? I do not know, but it is an issue that requires explanation, and our society is not characterized by this. If you try to look at a product very closely, you get crazy. It's not that information is not provided, but it is hided, access to it is prevented.

There are issues on television that a supine stupidity and people see them, you have to take the language.

Sometimes the obvious is highlighted why can't we do the same in agriculture? Follow the year calendar, the moon cycle, learn how to do things. Hasas, garlic, they are all plant differently, all this belongs to an ancient wisdom.

Sometimes people do not ask this information, but sometimes they are given, you have to provide it. But it is very difficult to sell this, I encounter this problem; if export pork to Russia or not, the effect on the crisis in Ukraine on this. How to "sell" this to our society?

It is also due to unconscious discredit of the sector.

There is an unconscious superiority of the urban over the rural. They discredit the physical work, even though it has been all mechanized now, although research and innovation have arrived now too. In the end, there is a lack of interest in what you eat.

We have to approach, try to make them understand that we are what we eat, and so we must know what we eat.

The media have abandoned their teaching and disseminating work. So far we have tried everything following the traditional methods. Television is nowadays made with just 4 boxes+ 1 video camera + 4 screaming individuals...

It's like the magma, there are many current programs that are worthless and you have to know what to choose.

- César Lumbreras: 20 years working in radio Agrocope, broadcasted at 9am. This program has a loyal audience (the journalist believes that there are few such initiatives and he thinks it will be positive and will benefit the sector).
- Vidal Maté: every 15 days, expert journalist
- Segre: "backbone" discussions are not originated when they should.

Blame it on the media. Journalism is in crisis, politics, everything. This issue should be paid more attention; it is a professional matter of. Our society is used to open their mouth and swallow everything. The Column in the Vanguard is read mostly by professionals, but in the end is read by everyone.
The way to communicate is with a specialized language. The problem is that specialization imposes royalties, but it's like any other field, answer basic questions that a journalist is: what, how, when, where. The image is full of agricultural topics.

My section is cogeneration with manures from pigs. It is necessary to explain that this is an environmental problem, what do we do with all that surpluses?

Image is important, no one would ever put a picture of the time of sacrifice (just then), it would be free cruelty, right?

During the swine Crisis (African swine fever) in the 90s, there were thousands of sacrifices, and I remember the pictures from that, and I remember to look for the image with the greatest impact: thousands of dead pigs dragged into the pit, maybe the most negative aspect, but what could better illustrate what was happening. So it was necessary.

The agro-food information can occur through all media. Internet is very informative: a source that people can master alone. The industry and the farmers control it and gives them the opportunity to het to more people.

There is an animal transport company, Rotecma that invoices € 27 million each year. They sell products for the pig industry: drinkers, feed, labour rooms spaces, etc. Everything that happens in the area of their interest: animal welfare standards, inseminations, health, food, etc. They have a website. The consumer / citizen can perfectly learn if they look properly and know how to discriminate information.

- What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare training activities for professionals? What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare training activities for professionals working with animals?

It is generally good. There is a good educational structure of the sector. The system is good in Catalonia and increased specialization in agricultural training schools. I think the vets and staff are trained in animal health professionals. I am aware that there are unskilled workers (it happens a lot in the agro sector, that unskilled workers are hired, but there is a great will for people to train and specialize this people).

Example: Guissona cooperative. (Idea: journalist is considered a very positive example). Every year they offer thousands of jobs and the company provides them certain degree of training. Referring to live animals, the company teaches courses on animal welfare, etc. I find this very positive, although there still could be more courses, it is noticeable that is in professionals’ hands.

- With respect to the strategy, I think these topics should be addressed in school.

- We still believe in advertising campaigns, these are inputs, not much but it helps to spread information about the sector.
- CAP: dissemination policy on the agro reality.
- I have the impression things are not so bad in Catalonia, maybe not good either, but elsewhere the situation is even worse.

Information campaigns are needed. For example, in Spain we do not eat enough rabbit. Why not campaign for this? These animal welfare laws to produce a better quality meat and try to change eating habits apply.

- What's currently in the media about AW and / or animal production?
- What can we do for this information to get to the citizens? Tell them about what is already legislated in animal welfare? Why do citizens demand more legislation if they do not actually know the current legislation?

Civilization evolves in a collective unconsciousness; in their ignorance they think that treating animals well have better products.
Gradually consumers want higher quality products, want to know where things come from, and thus taking shape that feeling of eating things here in house. Prox products, ecological, km = 0 are gaining in prestige, get more value added. This will be more and more.

The actions implemented for the recovery of native species, such as cow Bruna Pyrenees, beef cow, is to be sold at a price of its value.

PRODECA: Kosher (idea: Journalist Speaks of Kocher products as positive). The animal grows, cares and sacrifices so that may be the closest thing to ecology. These products move 500 billion dollars worldwide.

Why not make products Kocher here? It could be the salvation for the living. They also sell a lot animal in vivo. Not think they're incompatible. It would not cost anything to find ways to adapt, to keep the sector.

Information should be carefully looked at, cared for and treated it ... If it comes with some images, it is probably better.

Interview with Isidre Font (Agropress Association)

1) Questionnaire Citizens or consumers (to comment while doing the questionnaire).

    - Identify what issues concern them the most, where there is more misinformation and / or confusion.

The first thing that draws attention to the survey is the theme, so if you stop me on the street, what I would think is, has something happened? A survey that invites you to reflection. We start from a premise, which is the subject of animal welfare, with which I fully agree, from that I totally agree, I have to say that I do not believe in extremes, I there are nuances in everything, and well, what we said in the rules, I don’t believe in strict rules. A different thing is how we spanish people are, and how others are, and that we have to be taken here and there ... and that if we Germans, we would do things in a different way.

On the question about the law she shows a lack of knowledge on the issues that are legislated or not. In addition she doesn’t distinguish between recommendations and regulations.

The law must be followed, and there must be laws, but I think they are already restrictive enough; they must not to be more restrictive. More restrictive, no. However, it also depends, because laying poultry farmers, with the new law, they got very angry. On the contrary, in the case of legislation for poultry farming, well...

Why do your to make a legislation for beef or cattle, when a recommendation is enough? If I had a beef farm, I would try to follow the law, but, I have relation with food business, , and we knew we could do things that could poison the population, we were looking over all that.

But we have to keep in mind that food security is not necessarily linked to the welfare of the animal, that is to say, there are people who can keep their pet healthy, but not strictly fulfill welfare laws, it does. Well, I think not. I don’t know, I think people follow the animal welfare regulations, I trust people.

He is not sure when he answers the question of eggs. He discards it.

I know that I will purchase the eggs with the code 3, and free range, wich I bought one day because there wasn’t organic eggs, they were code 1, and therefore number 2 has to be that...

Every day there are many to feed, 700 million people worldwide, and there are kinds of foods such as vegetables and grains, not enough to feed us all

There has been a restructuring on farms in the last years, for example in dairy cattle. Now there are fewer farms, but farms that are left are more competitive and larger, in all species. Before epidemic swine in Catalonia there was a lot of pig farms, but now, there are fewer farms and they are more competitive and larger; three thousand, six thousand mothers, like poultry, like sheep, in dairy cows, now they have more heads. For example, yesterday I visited one farm and they had 150 cows. This was unthinkable 30 years ago.
2) The respondent experiences in the field of livestock / agriculture
   – How have it been as a communicator?

The fact that the information comes biased or not depends on the politic. The problem is that if you're not an expert on these topics, or if you’re not sure exactly who sent you this information, for example if you have a statement of 9 peasants and a statement that has a concrete thinking and on the same subject you have one from ASAJA, that is totally different, when you analyze you have to know that each one defends some interest because they are ideologically opposed. And hence, I want to say that sometimes the information we have is ... what happens is that sometimes you have to go by how quickly we have to transfer it, or because the agglomeration we have, we don’t have enough time to make the transcript of that information, and then you send it directly, without doing the filter.

Most of the times the person who transmits this information is not a professional. Perhaps we have simpler vision, because it is transmitted to the farmer in a more technical way, it is being transmitted in a more technical way to the administration, but of course, we tried to collect and send it in a simple way to the society. What I transmit to people is that agriculture is the only sector that has a common politic in Europe (fishing and agriculture), there is no sector with a common politic.

2.1 In the event of having to report on a story, how would you do? How do you bring nearer the audience?

2.2 How would you deal with for example the following situation?
You have to give the news that:
   a) "Spain has the best production of pigs in Europe"
   b) "In Spain slaughterhouses are closed because there are problems with cattle during unloading after transport"

The journalist has the culture of disaster. Having made specialized publications for a general audience, they made two types. I like to communicate positive things. Maybe it is not known that Spain has been between 1 and 2 in Europe. This could help to eliminate a lot of prejudices of the society "it smells like pork", "they can’t spend their weekend comfortably." It is said by people who make common agricultural politic. They said lets hope Lleida stops making such a pig smell, he said it publicly. How do they expect that the citizen is conscious, if we transmit the opposite? It should be taught in schools.

2.3 Basic rules of communication that must always meet, words that should or should not be used, what kind of language? So you’re always looking to get the most impact?

You must use a very simple language. Information is power. They don’t want people to know. It is given to people who..... EC is about smart dresses, getting a salary, just image.

I say this to you that because is what people says to me;..., the family, the cleaner. Everyone has their own opinion and we are all important.

For example: did you really talked to farmers about what kind of animal welfare politicy needs to be applied? Which are the correct ones?

Maybe we should be flexible. The same law in Finland is not applicable in Spain. Maybe we should make more flexible rules, even within the state. Explain to the whole society, that people know, that the consumer knows that you’re doing things to improve.

For example it is not said that a lot of research is being made, by INCA or IRTA ??? because of the difficulties to transmit this information to the society. Knowing that a destressed animal gives better quality product, people should know that.

They don't even comply with the regulations. We must be rigorous. Sometimes animal welfare and health are linked. Companies that in other countries have pigs who bring here, fulfill welfare animal rules in their countries. The consumer does not know about this.
In animal welfare journalism, specialists are scarce. Sometimes people covering this information belongs to economics, health, and sometimes they mix with animal welfare, mixing with human health. The trend is to provide information to the owner, and unfortunately agrarian sector doesn't sell. However, bad news sell: misfortunes, plagues.

2.4 Theme images / photos: criteria? Shocking, best not to put photos ...

If broadcasted by TV, for example images of the mad cows did a lot of damage, when these cows collapsed. If you speak about spongiform encephalopathy, at lunch time the impact is brutal. In animal welfare, the picture is worth a 1000 words.

2.5 BA Topics: Reviews, feedback, is there or not?, is more positive when the message is positive, or when the communicator makes a negative review? What extent influence the communicator and his way of sending the message to the public?

Sometimes with little you can do a lot, good or bad. The information, the way we have been informed ... We have to provide information, not opinion (now it is fashionable to give opinions in other fields, such as in sports). Information given must be believable.

It mus be based on the sources, such as the police, for example, increase credibility. In animal welfare issues, the source is essential, the ministry, local authorities, ... is important to the citizen. You shouldn't do "sensationalism". Rigor is necessary, but also that citizens believe and trust, I really believe in it. When we have to report, are privileged, we make a visit to the farm; 6, 7 or 10 are privileged to inform the entire country. They have to be very rigorous (so important in animal welfare).

3) General public: How to make the public confidence in farmers and their techniques? How to approach these two figures? What strategies could be followed? Examples.

People are not stupid, but are not informed. There are three ways. The link between animal welfare and the consumer is the journalist. Often the farmer is not the source, is the administration, they filter the info: more openness from Administration towards journalists and a greater specialization of journalists.

The headlines have to be short, it is important that info is not too long. At the time of reporting info must be concise. Positive information. A lot of collaboration, be aware of the news generated by the sector. Researchers move us forward.

*Niche of positive news: km 0, green market, fairs, etc. Training courses are being made by the agricultural schools (14), about the activities organized for the sector.

There are negative prejudices from the society because of the information they have received. I dont want to be critical but the main media, television, ...many times the image has not been the best. There are many informations now, but it is still controlled. I can confirm that In my 27 years of experience.

3.1 Overall concept of society on BA and animal production

It is a subject on which there is total disinformation. You say right now that producing pigs is the same as producing shoes, i mean... in terms of volume I'm talking about the scale of production, wich is large. When you tell them that there are 60,000 chickens for meat or 70,000 ,on a ship, people get shocked. What other misinformation are there, if we are talking about animal welfare in relation to consumption?

The first thing they say, "yes, they give us the shick ones, ...because they break their wings ...". That is misinformation, but of course people dont know. Why? Simply because they have not been to a farm, they do not know. How do they expect that someone goes to a farm and choose sick animals between the 70,000 chickens? Thats impossible. What happens is that animals that have been caught for chicken wings has fewer days of life than a broiler, classified by the farmers themselves. A broiler is a child with a man's body, because you're eating a baby. Because they get to the farm and catch the first 5000 they find
and take them, and of course, the rest as they have now more space, in 10-15 days gain weight, almost 1 kg more than the first they took have been.

3.2 What’s currently in the media about BA and / or animal production?

In the media they only broadcast this kind of news when something happens, when there is a crisis or something like that. If you stop me on the street and ask me about animal welfare, i would say ¿what happened? ¿Is there a crisis or a cow or a pig got infected?.Also, there is confusion between animal welfare and a health crisis, thats something which happens often. The same confusion that there is between a tomato from the soil and a organic tomato, and they are completely different.

3.3 Where would you considered to be the political and educational strategy in relation to this topic?

In regards to education, I would give this information at schools. The books of History of the world will be obsolete, the way to be informed will be la Vanguardia, el Mundo, etc. The history depends also of who writes and explains it. History is the daily press. It is important that media inform more about the sector. The agriculture sector (3%) and food sector account for 11-12% GDP. That’s something they don’t say. At schools they should read the news, and also, visit farms. It should be explained about foods, avoid conspiracy theories, ...people from the city should know what a chicken is, and how they live. At schools I would include road safety lesson and food producing. I would show them farms, factories, and slaughterhouses later on. I would show all the process.

When you talk about animals, it should be explained in a transversal way. Reality must be shown, animal anatomy, they should be taken to see live animals. For example, this week at the fair of Sort, I would teach them to shear the sheep.

To put education in context is needed, update the educational system. Regarding at home, we have to teach them there too. We have to educate. Equilibrium is the key.

At the fairs must be able to talk to the farmers, ask them things. Animal welfare is very important, it must be explained how the live, where, in what environment, what do they smell, etc. We cannot take things for granted. We have to react altogether as a society. But that’s not enough. Studies as yours have to be not only taken outside, but has to be used also, there must be someone who applies it. A lot of money is invested, but are they useful if they just remain there? Options to make everyone win must be implemented. At the end everyone should know more, what is being done, and what it implies for the society. With the exception of vegetarians, everyone eat meat.

The idea of “Camp a çTaula” wants to show the whole process. I am so interested.

Oscar del Peraino: is important to inform about it. People should know it. That there is a database, the research, the objectives, etc. The farmer has that interest. Populism is not sensationalism.

Regarding the professionals, there are more and more courses, not only official, but also non official courses: about animal welfare on farm, in transport.

Young people are very keen, also in the management of the company, has been training behind. Professionals are more and more prepared, there are still a lot to be done, yes, but more each time. Lots of seminars by the Administration are given.

Interview with Jesús Domingo (Agropress Association)

Experience as a communicator

Jesús Domingo has collaborated with the magazine “Young farmers” for more than 30 years. He has participated in documentaries about farms and has interviewed relevant actors of the sector.

His background is Technical Agricultural Engineering and he is currently the president of the agro-school in Benlloch del Pla.

1) Questionnaire Citizens or consumers (to comment while doing the questionnaire)
Identify what issues concern you the most, where there is more misinformation and/or confusion.

He comments that sensitivity within the public has increased due to the great influence of the media, and since sometimes production is indeed very intensive, I find this positive. How animals are treated? I think they have failed to answer the question about legislation. People at the street do really not know, not even at that time, when it was more recent. Regarding the question of the eggs, I don’t know anyone who looks at that or that has ever talked about it.

2) What is your experience with the livestock/agriculture sector? What is your experience as a communicator?

2.1 When you have to give the news, how do you do? How do you approach the public?

2.2 For example; how would you deal with the following situation?

You have to give the following news:

a) "Spain has the best pig production in Europe"

b) "Slaughterhouses close in Spain due to problems with the cattle during unloading after transport"

The communicator has a great influence, so they must be careful when it comes to communicating. The communicator has a great responsibility.

"They are recommending in some slaughterhouses ..."

The Administration threatened with closure if they don’t improve at short term/comply with the regulations. Possible reactions are: buying meat or rejecting the producer because someone is not doing well.

For me it would be news on the radio, on TV, but not to be included in a technical journal.

2.3. What basic rules of communication must always be met? Words that should or should not be used, what kind of language? So should we always look for the greatest impact?

He has written extensively on spongiform. Depending on what terms, you can’t use them indiscriminately; you must be able to differentiate (i.e. tail biting attention). Enter this term is positive because it draws attention. Information has to reach the audience.

2.4. Images, pictures: what are the criteria?

It depends on the media (radio, op-ed, etc.). If it is about negative issues they try not to put pictures. For example, if television shows cows falling over one another that increases the impact. It should be handled with care. If it is about positive issues, it is always necessary to highlight them.

BA Topics: Reviews, feedback, or is there no? Is more positive when the message is positive, or when the communicator makes a negative review? To what extents does this influence the communicator and his way of sending the message about the public?

If you want people to react you need to know in advance who knows and who has no idea. For example, when communicating about slaughterhouses to professionals, it is better to make a “more negative” approach, but if you are communicating consumers, this would be a risk, because they can turn back and reject it.

3) General public. How to make the public trust in farmers and their techniques? How to bring these two figures closer? What strategies could be followed? Please give examples.
Apart from the educational farms, not focus only with milking. You have to explain all, talk about everything, tell them that the animal may suffer, which must be avoided. Butchery: Mandatory traceability and no one follows this. Give value to the requirements that already exist in animal welfare standards, so they reach the consumer.

3.1 One of the problems we observed with our study is that people demand a BA standards and calling for more stringent legislation, but then is shown to have great ignorance about it in practice ignoring existing regulations.

Environmental movements have great influence. They are opposed by the intensive production system. In one occasion someone said to me "he did the newspaper for 5 million people and gave them what they wanted to hear." Media’s pressure for example increases with phytosanitary products and the death of bees. In many cases the aim is to humanize the animals, and I think it is a big mistake.

That’s because of lack of real knowledge. The idea is to transmit and change this perception; what the producer is concerned, well done production, the animals, etc. Because you live it and you want to transmit. You must to spread all good things done in production. More informative than technical. Sometimes there are uninformed journalists, who are not experts in the subject. Sometimes the media get someone not expert. You should go to the expert organizations, for example, when you need information about cattle raising. Topics about pork meat and beef meat are spoken every week on the television and on the radio. The aim of the visits in the ecologic farms is to inform the journalists, to explain them about the industry.

"Llet Natura" and "Llet Nostra" do scheduled school visits for 8-10 years old children. The aim is to show the cows, milking processing, milk treat and wine products (yogurt) freshly made. Some schools ask and go every year. Schools which are interested in promoting this. From educational point of view is very positive.

It will be difficult to include in the educational system, we have no culture about that, we don’t know how the food is produced.

The difference between Spain with other EU countries is that for example, China has small farms and Burgos had chickens and pigs, they ate the remains and family and animal excrements.

A young boy against of applying phytosanitarys explained to me his case. Pigs and chickens ate the excrements, eating what they had all around, naturally, and he said he would never eat that, unthinkable. What they want now, right? Those hens can dig even if it costs a vision in time and space to producers. Fundamental base to change the perception. After just wanting to treat animals like kittens, but not for ham, which is great.

The idea is that Administration, companies and trade union take steps to acquire specific courses for professionals. It would be one way to manage it. It’s also necessary that companies have initiative in this way. For example, it would be feasible do that in the slaughterhouses to assure a minimum formation. Llet natura have a map of productions. This gives more information about the product. The consumer appreciate that NGOs as Freedom Foods collaborate with the producer. This NGO have a protocol, with witch the producers can obtain a certificate on welfare animal if they apply it. This certificate allows them to achieve a better product. If Llet Natura do that, producers in Spain could obtain one certificate on welfare animal. To refer to unfair competition, producers and cattle raiser have to have a minimum quality of their products required from the legislation. For example, if they allow entering products from Brazil, there isn’t traceability. It isn’t known the origin of the product and which treat has receipt the animal and the meat. From my point of view all people go to the web pages. It is difficult to find the medium and the site. On Sunday people have more time and the demand increase. In order to reach a wider audience. If you want to get the producers is different, but better written than visual (which is volatile).
3.2 How to transmit to the public the message that in Europe we care about animal welfare and production animals?

There is a great sensitivity to animals. More women than men. Consider an animal as a living being itself.

3.3. Overall concept of society on animal welfare and animal production.
A lot of awareness on the issue of welfare animal and its surroundings.

3.4. What is the role of the media? Do they play the good or the bad?

In crisis. The role of the media is negative, the most sensationalist. The journalist is able to change the white, as requires the medium, the online editor. There is lack of basic education from the consumers, from the press. If the journalist has the idea that spongiform is mortal, he will transmit that to the society. It is present a lack of knowledge of the reality.

3.5. According to some preliminary results, most people get the information from the mass media such as TV and internet, and to a lesser extent on the radio. From your experience, what communication tools would be the best suited?

It increases the impact on television. Comes as it goes. Tomorrow is another day and another thing; the impact is short-lived. A series of articles for a while to a professional media can have a lot of impact. If it was the Vanguardia, better, because animal welfare it is associated with production and quality.
Appendix 20: EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS

1. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare training activities for farmers, veterinaries, transporters, slaughter personnel, etc, in the EU?
   If you think the situation is different for different groups, please specify. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify. Please indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses.

There is no harmonization regarding trainings or educational activities for professionals, and there is no common understanding of the implementation either, it is so fragmented between all Member states. I.e we have farm experts who work with trained operators, and they find it is so different from one country to another. I.e recently they have been working on the pigs and broilers Directive, and there are no common levels of education. Our farming experts know that some professionals take 1 course one time, and then after no follow up. In some countries you can find educational programs or initiatives, but they are not aligned with other countries, there is no coordination between Member States, and many operators work crossed borders. I.e one of our members in Spain, ANDA, is providing training for transporters, the Italian member, ALIVI, is training the police forces, etc. NGOs make a great labour on education, but this important task shouldn’t relay just on NGOs, the Government should take responsibility on this; with very little effort, a huge improvement could be achieved.
We need a competent Centre that is entirely dedicated to education, that provides all the information and education on AW, and that harmonizes this education, for both, professionals and citizens.
The truth is we are not very specific on who should do it yet, but we think this centre should be managed by the European commission, but should be crossed Commission, not only managed by SANCO. I.e the Education Department could take part. This Centre would provide more uniformity and would increase and improve the capacity of professionals.

2. What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare training activities for professionals working with animals: farmers, veterinarians, transporters, Zoo personnel, etc...?
   If you think the situation is different for different groups, please specify. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify.

Education of professionals should be enforced by law.
We need tailor made solutions; the main gap is the huge diversity between Member States and the lack of education. I.e in Slovakia, breeders have a very different knowledge than the breeders in Belgium or the Netherlands, and this inevitably, has an impact on, let’s say, the “product”. And consumers are misled.
If these professionals are not educated people, how can they guarantee, not just animal welfare, but also food safety or consumers health?
It is neglected, they just leave it to the member states, and they cannot do this alone.
We can identify good practices in countries like the UK, Denmark, Belgium, or Austria, which is a different case from the rest due to the enforcement through legislation, and they could be an example to move to other countries, a good to start, to build on that.
I.e one debate was whether there should be 27 reference centres, and the final proposal from the EC is that there should be no more than 4 or 5, (located in countries such as the above mentioned and integrated in an existing structure). It was said that we cannot expect to create something new, but to use what we already have in terms of infrastructures, staff and knowledge.
Also I would recommend that the EC invested some money. We are aware of the lack of legislation for many species, but not all efforts should be on enforcing and implementing; education is vital.
I would say that I also find some differences between professionals working with animals, i.e normally the level of education of people working with animals in the lab is better than farmers or slaughterhouse personnel. This is because there are stronger legal requirements, and also because in general terms need a higher educational background to start working in a lab.
I.e they could use other tools, enrich the educational material, enrich their website, support the translation of educational material. We are continuously developing educational material, because there is a huge lack of it, and of educational programs offered from the Government.

We have developed some guidelines for transportation of animals, one of our biggest issues, and we had a huge struggle to get the EC investing in such things. We worked with Copa-Cogeca to develop some guidelines on bovine, and now on pigs and horses. We distribute them by email, by printing hard copies, and also try to sell them to the competent authorities within the different countries, also in countries in which we have encountered the main problems. We would like to develop apps for the smart phones, but this is something we will try in the future.

3. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU? Indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses (i.e. agree/disagree on who should or shouldn't be in charge of these activities)

The majority of this type of education is implemented by the NGOs, and almost entirely left to them. We are part of a working group, very active on this type of education, but more forces should join for this task. And it's not a matter of money...

The zoos also implement some educational activities, but I doubt this is the institution to educate, it's no neutral and they have their own interests. Maybe it shouldn't be just an institution. I.e in the Netherlands there's a network, subsidized by the community which dedicates to education and they address AW education, implement it in local schools, develop the material, etc.

Our big goal for the future is to educate young people, consumers and citizens.

4. What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU? If you think the situation is different for different groups, please specify. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify.

I think the 1st step should be to integrate AW education in the National Curriculum of all Member States. To make it compulsory is the only way to change this.

5. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU? If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify. Indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses.

I know that in some countries you can find some initiatives to inform the public, i.e in the UK, RSPCA makes short documentaries on TV, and some members of our organization also use the TV to inform in some countries. I would say more in the Northern countries, the south of Europe is different (maybe this is related with moral standards or cultural beliefs), but I don't know if any of these initiatives has ever come from the Government.

I would like to know more about this. I.e I know there's a lot going on lately in Italy, there has been an evolution on the way citizens look at animals, so now educational initiatives would be very well accepted.

6. What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU?

Absolutely, I think this policy should be enforced. Animals are sentient beings, and in the Treaty it says we should guarantee their... So the reality of every day is that we all have a role to play there.

Education should be part of the EU agenda. People should be able to understand why do we legislate, and for that we need to inform them, and beyond that, we need to educate them. No matter who takes the lead, but there is almost no information towards the public, and information has to be provided.
I know that in some countries you can find some initiatives to inform the public, i.e in the UK, RSPCA makes short documentaries on TV, and some members of our organization also use the TV to inform in some countries. I would say more in the Northern countries, the south of Europe is different (maybe this is related with moral standards or cultural beliefs), but I don’t know if any of these initiatives has ever come from the Government.

I would like to know more about this. I.e I know there’s a lot going on lately in Italy, there has been an evolution on the way citizens look at animals, so now educational initiatives would be very well accepted. As I said before, our big goal for the future is to educate young people, consumers and citizens. At the moment, we are focusing on the method of production labelling, to improve the information that is provided to them, because even if consumers want to know more, they can’t.
Appendix 21: BORN FREE FOUNDATION

1. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare training activities for professionals working with animals: farmers, veterinarians, transporters, zoo personnel, etc, in the EU? If you think the situation is different for different groups, please specify. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify. Please indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses.

Member States’ competent authorities
Generally, Member States’ competent authorities (i.e. enforcement agencies, zoo inspectors, state-employed veterinarians, border enforcement, judiciary), responsible for animal protection and the regulation of the facilities that keep animals in captivity, often lack fundamental knowledge about animal welfare science and how a good state of welfare can be achieved. Ultimately, this can result in the creation of legislation that fails to take into consideration, or adequately ensure, animal welfare. In addition, existing inspection procedures frequently fail to evaluate an animal’s welfare and are unable to identify poor standards of animal husbandry and care. Knowledge and expertise in animal welfare is particularly poor for wild animals, which include thousands of species, each with their own specific welfare needs. The regulation of zoos, dolphinariums, circuses, the private keepers of exotic pets, the trade in wildlife, etc., is therefore extremely problematic for Member State governments, which often lack the relevant in-house knowledge and expertise.

This paradox is highlighted when comparing welfare requirements for the keeping animals in zoos, which are required in some EU countries. Comparison between species-specific minimum housing requirements reveals huge variance (i.e. an outdoor space for three female elephants in Austria must be a minimum area of 3000 m², whilst in Lithuania it is 375 m² \(^{61}\), suggesting that these standards are rarely based upon animal welfare science, but instead self-regulation and political will. Equally, inspection procedures and animal welfare assessment in many EU Member States consist of standardised measurements of the space within which an animal is kept, rather than an assessment of the quality of that space and the conditions and needs of the animal. Despite the Constitutional requirement in the European Union to recognise animals are sentient (Article 13 of the Treaty), little investment has been made to ensure Member State competent authorities are sufficiently knowledgeable and appropriately trained.

This was the conclusion of the Born Free Foundation, authors of the EU Zoo Inquiry\(^{62}\), when its extensive investigation of zoo regulation in 20 Member States identified that the lack of knowledge and expertise of competent authorities was one of the main reasons for the poor implementation and enforcement of the EC Zoos Directive (no.1999/22). When consulted, as part of the Inquiry, authorities from 21 of the then 27 EU Member States confirmed that training in the basics of animal welfare science and the fundamentals of the EC Zoos Directive would be welcomed (2012). This need for knowledge and training was also apparent in a consultation process undertaken with all EU Member States (2013) that contributed to the development of the forthcoming EC Zoos Directive Guidance and Good Practice Document. Of the feedback received, 87% of the responding Competent Authorities (n=15) required further information about “animal welfare requirements”, as stipulated by the EC Zoos Directive 1999/22, and 87% also requested further information about the “conservation measures”.

To date, only the governments of the UK and Spain appear to have ensured zoo inspectors receive training, but even these have been suspended due to the implementation of austerity measures.

Following the recommendations of the EU Zoo Inquiry (2012), the European Commission tendered for the development of a guidance document to assist Member State competent authorities and zoo operators in


\(^{62}\) www.euzooinquiry.eu
the correct interpretation of the requirements of the EU Zoos Directive. The EC Zoos Directive Guidance and Good Practice Document is expected to be published in the autumn 2014. Whilst it is to be welcomed, the document will only achieve its goals and improve enforcement and standards in zoos, if it is read and examples of good practice are effectively applied.

Private sector
A limited knowledge of animal welfare science is also evident in the private sector. Veterinary practitioners, for example, are expected to be able to provide advice relating to a huge variety of both domestic and wild animals kept as companion animals, but often lack fundamental knowledge in animal welfare (FVE 2009; BFF & FVE, 2014). Equally, the owners of pet animals, who acquire both domestic and wild animals through pet shops, some zoos and, increasingly, over the Internet, often lack basic knowledge about appropriate animal care, despite efforts by some NGOs to ensure such information is readily available.

The knowledge of professional animal keepers can vary too. Whilst in some European countries animal keepers have access to, and are required to undertake relevant training, in other European countries there is no such a stipulation and facilities are able to employ animal keepers without appropriate knowledge or experience. It is therefore unsurprising that animals are observed in substandard conditions that compromise their welfare.

2. What do you think should be the policy on animal welfare training activities for professionals working with animals: farmers, veterinarians, transporters, Zoo personnel, etc...?
If you think the situation is different for different groups, please specify. If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify.

Member State’s competent authorities
Member State governments must do more to improve the welfare and protection of animals that are in our care. This can only be properly addressed and improved when legislation prioritises the welfare of the animal; inspection procedures ensure consistency in application and consider the welfare of the animal; and competent authorities are appropriately and regularly trained.

Recognising that maintaining high standards of animal welfare is unlikely to be achieved through subsidiarity (devolution of responsibility to the individual Member State), due to lack of political will, the demand on resources and the need for specialists, animal protection law should be regulated and supported by EU policy. The proposed European Animal Welfare Framework Law could be an ideal mechanism to meet this requirement. Furthermore, EU training initiatives, such as Better Training for Safer Foods, should be adapted for all genres of animals to help improve knowledge and build the capacity of competent authorities. Without the sharing of knowledge and resources across the Community, standards in animal welfare and level of protection are unlikely to improve and wild animals in captivity, in particular, will remain in substandard conditions.

Private sector
Higher levels of effective regulation must be established within European Member States that ensure improved animal welfare. Animals should not be kept unless their housing facilities are deemed appropriate for the needs of the species and further, that their keepers are sufficiently knowledgeable.

Exercising initiatives such as a species ‘positive list’ will also help to limit the animal species that can be kept as companion animals. This will not only reduce the burden on veterinary practitioners but, also reduce the potential risks of injury to the pet owner and ensure improved animal welfare and protection.

NGO support
Recognising that the Member State competent authorities need access to training in order to improve the implementation and enforcement of existing animal protection legislation, but acknowledging that the
European Commission operates minimal training programmes, it is NGOs that often find the means to deliver such support. This has included the training of zoo inspectors in Spain, environmental police in Italy and veterinarians in Romania.

The Born Free Foundation, together with the global specialist in veterinary support, VetEffecT, are currently offering customised training to benefit Member State competent authorities, whose responsibility it is to implement and enforce legislation concerning the health, welfare and protection of wild animals in captivity. They are using an online questionnaire to identify knowledge gaps and training needs to ensure the customised training, delivered by independent experts, meets the specific needs of each authority and is relevant to the animals concerned. It is hoped that the training will help to improve enforcement of existing legislation regulating zoos, dolphinariums, circuses, the keeping of exotic pets and wildlife trade.

**European Commission support**

Whilst the European Commission has developed regulations, guidance and training programmes to improve the knowledge of competent authorities and improve animal welfare science in the context of production animals, little support has been given to assist Member State governments in delivering their obligations to ensure the protection of wild animals in captivity and the regulation of facilities that house or use them. As explained previously, Member State competent authorities generally lack relevant knowledge in the effective management of this genre of animals and would normally expect the European Commission to provide relevant guidance. Whilst guidance for the keeping of animals in zoos has recently been produced, guidance on the keeping of wild animals for other purposes, such as the trade in and keeping of exotic pets is non-existent.

The apparent reason for this failure to support Member State competent authorities concerns the supposed competencies of the relevant Director-Generals (DG) of the European Commission, namely the DG of Environment, Maritime Affairs & Fisheries (formerly Environment) and the DG of Heath & Food Safety (Formerly Health & Consumers). Whilst Heath & Food Safety includes the Animal Welfare Unit, it does not consider animals of wild species. DG Environment, Maritime Affairs & Fisheries is responsible for the implementation of the EC Zoos Directive (relating to the keeping of wild animals in zoos), however, it will not take responsibility for providing guidance on welfare provision. Therefore, with no Director-General taking responsibility, the issue receives no support, despite the obvious need from many Member States.

3. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare education activities for secondary school students and university students not related to bioscience in the EU? And what do you think should be the future policy on animal welfare education? 
Indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses (i.e. agree/disagree on who should or shouldn’t be in charge of these activities)

**Schools**

Whilst it is not known to what degree animal welfare science is taught in schools in the European Union, the Born Free Foundation would advocate delivering at least a basic understanding that all animals are sentient and can experience pain, suffering and distress. Ideally, animal welfare should be incorporated in the national school curriculum and taught as part of moral and developmental education.

A number of animal welfare focused NGOs are engaged in education programmes for young people, but these tend to topic led (i.e. production animals), as opposed to providing a board overview of animal welfare science.

**Higher Education**

Unless students are taking an animal-related undergraduate or postgraduate degree, it is unlikely that there will be any form of education on this topic. However, where topics are relevant, or involves activities that have a direct, or indirect impact on animals (i.e. animal management, wildlife conservation), students should have at least a basic understanding of animal welfare science. Veterinarians are usually the government-appointed agents responsible for evaluating the welfare of animals, assessing compliance and recommending improvements. However until recently, veterinary
science education has only included minimal or no education regarding animal welfare science. Graduates have been reliant on postgraduate and vocational courses to gain such knowledge. This would therefore indicate that veterinarians are not always the most appropriate professionals to assess an animal’s welfare, a role that may be better served by an animal welfare scientist.

It is understood that in some places veterinary education now includes more theoretical and practical animal welfare science, which must be encouraged in all Member States.

4. What do you think about the current situation on animal welfare information/communication activities for general public and consumers in the EU? And what do you think should be the future policy? If you think the situation is different between countries, please specify. Indicate if possible strengths and weaknesses.

Knowledge of and the importance given to animal welfare in society is certainly dependent upon the nationality, culture, background and career of individual members of the public. The British, for example, are known as an ‘animal loving’ nation and the United Kingdom certainly has large numbers of NGOs working on behalf of its citizens to protect animals. Other countries in the European Union, such as Bulgaria, Romania, France, Spain and Italy, would seem to regard animal welfare as being of lesser importance.

Animal welfare is a moral issue in society and there should be a general awareness amongst Europe’s citizens that animals are sentient and can experience pain, suffering and distress. The welfare of animals must be protected by society by stringent legislation, and any acts of cruelty or neglect should receive severe penalties to act as a significant deterrent. This should include prohibiting the ownership/keeping/management of animals following a successful prosecution.

If animals are to be kept, regardless of the species, the owner must be sufficiently knowledgeable so as to be able to provide appropriate living conditions and levels of care that meet the animal’s physical, behavioural and psychological needs.

Government authorities and agencies responsible for the protection of animals and the regulation of their use, or keeping, must be sufficiently knowledgeable about animal welfare science and all relevant national and international legislation. Breaking the law, particularly if it compromises the welfare of animals or carries significant risk to their keepers or members of the public, should receive severe penalties to act as a significant deterrent.
Appendix 22: FAADA (In Spanish)

FAADA comenzó como protectora y luego hizo un convenio con diez refugios en España. En esta fundación apadrinan animales y les dan los RR. Cuando entró Jenny Berengueras se hicieron otros animales; peletería, circo, zoo, experimentación, etc. Su trabajo es asesorar, rescatar/adoptar, informar de leyes y campañas y cuidar de animales salvajes en cautividad y mascotas exóticas. En el caso de los circos, informan a los ayuntamientos y prohíben forzar los animales a desarrollar comportamientos anormales. En el caso de los zoos, muchos no tienen licencia en España.

En referencia a los delfinarios, se hizo una encuesta de opinión. La gente no tenía ni idea de lo que pasaba en los delfinarios. España es el país con más delfinarios de Europa (más de 100 delfines, orcas y belugas). Los delfinarios son iguales que el zoo según la ley. Es muy necesaria la labor de concienciación.

Los animales free son animales salvajes usados en películas, anuncios, etc. Los target son agencias de publicidad (anuncios que aplauden/anuncian). El target principal es el sector turístico (en general tienen una buena recepción).

En referencia a los animales exóticos, la gente no debe abandonar tortugas en estanques, parques, etc. Se hacen campañas de concienciación. También se hacen denuncias a particulares para intentar que cedan los animales y de esta forma buscar algún hogar más adecuado para ellos.

Hay un libro por los 10 años de FAADA. Se hizo un análisis con abogados, psicólogos, etc. para intentar saber por qué hacemos lo que hacemos con los animales. También se elaboró un documental con la idea de que llegara en los festivales, redes sociales, etc. En los animales de granja, la campaña que tuvo más éxito fue la de los huevos.

La labor educativa de los zoos es muy pobre, pero siguen teniendo y exhibiendo animales y también hacen espectáculos. Tendrían que reconvertirlos a centros de conservación de verdad.

Las ONG tienen una labor educativa. Debemos ser sinceros con los niños e intentar que sean críticos y tomen sus propias decisiones. El Gobierno tendría que tomar parte directamente en el asunto. La información es muy sesgada por los grandes influyentes.

En general los profesionales tienen una formación muy pobre. En los zoos en concreto son gente más capacitada, que no necesariamente están de acuerdo con el zoo, pero están limitados. Incluso hay asociaciones que están en contra, pero que por el dinero jamás se posicionan. En una clase de etología de Xavi M. dijo que lo primero eran los clientes. Los trabajadores de las tiendas de animales tampoco están formados.
Appendix 23: Workshop with NGO's within the Aware project

During the workshop of the Aware project in Macedonia, the 8th October 2013, the Educawel project, organized discussion sessions about the approach (objective and methodology) of the Educawel project with several stakeholders. A summary of the main suggestions proposed by Krzysztof Jedrzejewski (Eurogroup for animals), Alexandra Hammond (RSPCA), Jelena Llic (ORCA), Romana Sonkova (Compassion in World Farming), Miro Tulak (Association of Slovak Consumers) and Urska Markelj (independent consultant) are described below.

The first question addressed in the discussion was: who must be the responsible for training and information on animal welfare in the EU? The NGO’s did not consider relevant to have a specific policy in the EU dealing with this issue. On the other hand, when they were asked about which is the best way to improve animal welfare in the EU, education was the agreed answer. The NGO’s exposed the worry about the big gap between the consumer’s perception and the real way of animal production for food, milk, etc... Initiatives such as ‘farmland’ do not help to give a realistic view about how the real production is. In some cases, retailers use strategies that difficult the delivery of clear and transparent information to the consumers, such as in the case of the eggs in Poland, where it is difficult for the consumer to find the production system in which laying hens are housed. The NGO’s agreed on using animal based measures to label the products.

According to those NGO’s, education should take into consideration different strategies according to the target, children or consumers. Language and ways to comunitace must be different. Some of participants in the discussion suggested using the concept of “information” to the consumers and let them the freedom of choice. The general agreement was to establish two stages of a good education/information, education about emotions in children, and education about real life in adults.

By the end of the day they agreed about the need to develop European standards of education on animal welfare for children, citizens and consumers. They don’t consider responsible of the education of professionals that should be taken by the authorities. They also agreed on the need to inform the the European citizens about the legislation of protection of the animals, the role they play and the initiatives they can follow, in addition to the different type of production systems. There was a big discussion about the distinction between citizens and consumers. The final conclusion was that education/information begins with the citizens and finishes with the consumers. Information through the in public TV and other public media is considered the most neutral (not biased to company interests) way to target the citizens. The NGO’s demanded to take official part these procedures, improving their representation and increasing the access to the citizens. However, they found difficult that the government can fund NGO’s to explain animal welfare to the citizens.

On the other hand, NGO’s believe that the authorities should provide more information to the citizens. However, there is a big discussion on how to do it, at local level or European level. There is no a final agreement on this point. They think that this responsibility could be supported by the national animal welfare reference centres of the Member States. In fact, they consider that according to the European Strategic plan, funds should be provided to implement the education of animal welfare in the EU.

In relation to the consumers, the NOG’s consider important to inform them about the production systems and the best way to do it is in the shops with labelled products. Concepts such as human health, animal health, animal welfare, sustainability and product quality are key factors to consider in this strategy of information.

NGO’s consider that farmers also need some information/education, not only related with vocational training, but also about consumer’s expectation, how to achieve a closer contact with them. In some countries, a funded programme has been developed to help farmers to sell fresh meat in big cities, being considered an interesting way to approach these two sectors. In some cases, visits to organic and conventional farms are also organised.
Appendix 24: Workshop on animal welfare education in Austria
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2013 the European Commission launched the research project EDUCAWEL about education and information activities in Europe. The institute for research and technology in food and agriculture (IRTA, Spain) is coordinating the project in which several member states take part. The association “Tierschutz macht Schule” is Austrian project partner and took over the task to portrait the situation around Animal Welfare Education Austria. In that context the workshop “Animal Welfare Education in Austria” was hold on the 16th of December 2013 in Vienna.

The objectives of the workshop were

1. An overview of Animal Welfare Education programs in Austria.
2. Learning from the experiences made and developing future scenarios such as the creation of a European Animal Welfare Education Reference Centre.
3. Comparing the situation in Austria with other member states.

Various experts gave presentations about animal welfare education and

- The Austrian Animal Welfare Act
- The Association “Tierschutz macht Schule”
- The formal education sector
- Consumers
- Professionals
- Practical experiences in schools
- Europe
Like that a profound picture of Austrian Animal Welfare Education was provided. This aimed at enabling the EDUCAWEL project to compare Austrian approaches and also give recommendations for the European Union based thereupon.

**Limited form of the AGENDA**

**Monday 16th of December 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:30 – 08:45</td>
<td>Registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08:45 – 09:00</td>
<td>Address of welcome</td>
<td>Mag. Marie-Helene Scheib (Tierschutz macht Schule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:00 – 09:25</td>
<td>EDUCAWEL project and introduction</td>
<td>Maria Moreno (IRTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:25 – 10:50</td>
<td>Presentations and discussion about:</td>
<td>Dr. Ulrich Herzog (Austrian Federal Ministry of Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Education and the Austrian Animal Welfare Act</td>
<td>DI Monika Hametter (Tierschutz macht Schule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Overview about Austrian Animal Welfare Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:50 – 11:10</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10 – 12:30</td>
<td>Presentations and discussion about:</td>
<td>Dr. Erik Schmid (Veterinarian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The view of the Austrian public</td>
<td>Toni Hubmann (Toni’s Freilandeier)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Enabling animal friendly purchasing decisions</td>
<td>Mag. Daniela Lipka (Tierschutz macht Schule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How can consumers be educated?</td>
<td>Maria Moreno (IRTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30 – 17:00</td>
<td>Presentations and discussion about:</td>
<td>Dr. Christine Leeb (University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incl. Coffee break</td>
<td>- “Cow practitioner” and Stable schools</td>
<td>Prof. Josef Troxler (University of Veterinary Medicine, Vienna)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Teaching experiences in animal welfare from the University of</td>
<td>Dr. Erik Schmid (Veterinarian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Veterinary Medicine, Vienna</td>
<td>Mag. Gudrun Braun (Tierschutz macht Schule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Professional education</td>
<td>BED Judith Breinbauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “Pet Buddy” project</td>
<td>Mag. Marie-Helene Scheib (Tierschutz macht Schule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Animal welfare in schools</td>
<td>Maria Moreno (IRTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How are teaching materials made?</td>
<td>DI Monika Hametter (Tierschutz macht Schule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Criteria for success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Europe, quo vadis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00 – 17:10</td>
<td>Summary and final comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:15</td>
<td>Final words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUMMARY of the WORKSHOP CONTENT

On the following pages a short overview about the presentations, discussions and group work is provided.

1. First Session presentations

“Overview about and experiences from the EDUCAWEL project”
by Maria Moreno

Maria Moreno first explained that due to the progressive situation of Animal Welfare Education in Austria, this country is considered a case study about successful approaches and experiences for the EDUCAWEL project. She further showed some statistics of preliminary results about how much primary school children in the other countries of research knew about animal welfare etc. The general knowledge level was very low which is probably linked to the fact that in none of the countries Animal Welfare is mentioned in the curricula.

“Animal Welfare Education and the Austrian Animal Welfare Act”
by Dr. Ulrich Herzog (Austrian Federal Ministry of Health)

Dr. Herzog presented the history and elaboration of the Austrian Animal Welfare Act in regard of paragraph 2 which contains a legal requirement for animal welfare education directed at the general public but also children and the youth.

Discussion and questions

During the discussion Dr. Herzog explained how the integration of animal welfare in school lessons was made possible due to various meetings with teachers and representatives of the Austrian education sector.

It was further mentioned that the way Animal Welfare is included in the Austrian curricula also reflects the way that society deals with animals: more “animal welfare” in younger years/lower grades and starting from the secondary level just “Pets” or “Farm animals” per se which reflects consumerism, followed by “technical aspects” of animals when it comes to vocational education.

It was further proposed to integrate the issue of animal welfare more in the curricula e.g. in the subject “ethics” as the curricula of “biology” is already full.

Participants also argued that animal welfare should as well be part of every other subject e.g. German, Maths etc.

“Tierschutz macht Schule” (Association for Animal Welfare Education)
by Mag. Marie-Helene Scheib (Tierschutz macht Schule)

Mag. Marie-Helene Scheib presented how the association „Tierschutz macht Schule” was founded and showed its various activities in the field of animal welfare education. She further explained how the teaching materials are structured and mentioned the successful output of the association.

“An overview about Animal Welfare Education for the formal education sector in Austria” by DI Monika Hametter (Tierschutz macht Schule)
In this presentation the participants received information about the way animal welfare is included in the Austrian curricula. Further DI Monika Hametter explained the importance of extracurricular offers like “Tierschutz macht Schule” and also showed examples from other organisations in Austria.

1.1. First Session group work

Question 1 in this interactive session was worked on as a whole group, while question 2 and 3 were answered by two groups.

**Question 1: Why is this legal requirement so important?**
- Sets minimum standard
- Makes it easier for teachers to know what to integrate in their lessons
- Enables integration into biology curriculum and the teaching principle “environmental education”
- Broad basis, valid for everyone
- In whole day schools: should encourage excursions such as farm visits
- Still the amount of animal welfare actually imparted in lessons depends on the dedication of the teacher
- Encouragement
- Important official sign also for funding because “education” itself is hard to sell

**Question 2: Characteristics of AWE in official education in Austria?**
There was a discussion in this group about the imbalance of how animal welfare is imparted in schools. It obviously really depends on which animal group you are taking about. On the one hand there are companion animals, which are emotionally more valued. They are often discussed in primary school, whereas farm animals are an issue at secondary school and are more technically discussed. Which means in school speciesism is very alive.

- Speciesism (discrimination on a different level of different species, found in legislation and public)
- Animal welfare in legislature.
  Pro: legal basis, Conflict: “Animal”

**Question 3: Examples from other European countries (legal basis and education)**
The compared countries were Lithuania, Belgium, UK, Spain and International schools. Results showed that the AWE in this countries is in some aspects extremely various, while in other they are equal. None of these countries had a legal requirement for animal welfare. UK, Spain and Belgium already have a strong animal welfare law, while in Lithuania it is still missing. They had in common that in most of the countries there do exist volunteering Animal Welfare Organisations. Every country seems to provide animal welfare education in Kindergarten, which mainly consists of games and pictures. The biggest difference was found in primary and secondary schools, where UK and Spain do have animal welfare education already mentioned in the curriculum, while the situation is not clear in Belgium and Lithuania. Just the opposite occurs in professionals, where Belgian and Lithuania have more animal welfare integrated. International schools also have the option of integrating animal welfare education in class but it depends on the companies.
2. Second Session presentations

“The view of the Austrian public about Animal Welfare in agriculture and products” by Dr. Erik Schmid (Specialist Veterinarian Animal Husbandry and Animal Welfare)

In this Presentation two different studies were presented in which the main questions of responsibility of consumers and producers were evaluated. One presentation from the University of Uppsala showed the expectations of society towards agriculture, especially on pig-production. The other study was an interview survey with personnel handling animals in Vorarlberg (Austria) and showed their attitude towards animal welfare. Dr. Schmid further gave an overview about the general perception of animal welfare in Austria.

In the discussion it was stated that it is not possible to generalize “farmers” as for example a study on sheep farmers about animal welfare showed, that they do care a lot more on behaviour indicators and general impression, than the pig farmers in the other study did.

“Enabling consumers to make an animal friendly purchasing decision” by Toni Hubmann, presented by Christiane Obereder-Nazar (both Toni’s Freilandier)

In this presentation suggestions about the content of information for consumers were given such as e.g. an animal friendly stable, the needs of animals, background of the animal friendly products and why they are more expensive etc. It was shown that in Austria and Germany various labels about animal welfare and ethics exist which can easily confuse the consumers. Toni Hubmann also presented an initiative for a new labelling system for animal welfare which was elaborated by international working groups and which enables consumers to quickly judge how animal friendly a product is.

After the presentation it was discussed on which guidelines the animal welfare assessment for the products is based and which indicators are taken into account (e.g. feather picking).

“How can consumers be educated?” by Mag. Daniela Lipka (Tierschutz macht Schule)

Mag. Daniela Lipka explained that people learn best when they don't notice they are learning and when one manages to create positive emotions around an issue. This also applies to animal welfare. Mag. Lipka therefore showed a couple of examples from “Tierschutz macht Schule" which follow this principle such as a brochure for hikers, which is called “Fit for the Muh-Rendezvous”.

2.1 Second Session group work

In this session three questions were worked on by three groups.

**Question 1: Which information should be given when educating consumers?**

- Information on Animal Welfare
  - Animal husbandry +/-
    - Animal welfare assessment
  - Human welfare/Working conditions
- Production chain
  - Feed, raising, slaughtering
  - Further processing
- Transparency
Question 2: How does AWE contribute to the information of consumers and is it able to change their behaviour? If so how can we measure it?

Ad “How”:
- Law
- Education only a part of information/awareness (advertising, society, internet…)
- More information:
  - more options
  - more awareness
  - more inspiration
- Animal welfare education a starting point to animal welfare
- Empowerment
- Quality of information/tools for assessing quality
- Honesty
- Emotion → facts → emotion → change behaviour
- Link to “human life” (health, welfare, you are what you eat…)
- Ownership
- Working with “opposition”

Ad “Are we able to change the behaviour?”
- YES
- Small steps
- Different strategies for different situations

Ad “How to measure the effects?”
- Number of farms/system
- Number of sold eggs/meat….. /system
- Pets: ways of selling…

Question 3: Which are the next steps in consumer education?
- No more wrong and flaky information
- Labels (conflict → reduce and simplify)
- One label (e.g. eggs 0/1/2/3)
- Mandatory
- New life style (make animal welfare become “hip”)
  - retailers
  - what is our food worth
  - conventional ideologies (conflict)
It was also mentioned that not all persons care about the welfare of animals and as long as e.g. the meat is cheap they are satisfied and will buy it. It was also doubted whether making animal welfare “hip” works as there are also the “LOHAS” (persons following a Lifestyle Of Health And Sustainability).

3. Third Session presentations

“Cow practitioners and stable schools”
by Dr. Christine Leeb (University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences, Vienna)

Dr. Christine Leeb presented the method of stable schools which was developed by Mette Vaarst in the context of international development and the project “Cow practitioner” which evolved out of that approach. Both methods aim at creating a surrounding of motivation and ownership as well as facilitating animal welfare for farmers. The successful “Cow practitioner” (a cooperation of the University of Natural Resources, Vienna and Bio Austria) is also a case study for the EDUCAWEL project.

“Practical teaching experiences in animal welfare from the University for Veterinary Medicine Vienna” by Prof. Dr. Josef Troxler (University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna)

In his presentation Prof. Dr. Troxler explained that the University of Veterinary Medicine teaches its students and also postgraduates, official veterinarians as well as other stakeholders about animal welfare. The focus lies on behaviour and husbandry systems, welfare and health, the human animal relationship and animal welfare law. The university follows the system of the “red line” which means that animal welfare is included and appears in all levels of the teaching with the aim of fostering the understanding of interactions, the capacity of adaptations and the indicators of welfare. Animal welfare is also understood as preventative medicine and as part of food quality.

“An overview about Animal Welfare Education for professionals in Austria”
by Dr. Erik Schmid (Specialist Veterinarian Animal Husbandry and Animal Welfare)

Dr. Erik Schmid presented an overview about the legal competence requirements, certificates and courses for farmers, transporters, slaughterhouse personnel, veterinarians, technicians as well as zoo personnel, pet shop personnel and researchers concerning Animal Welfare in Austria.

4. Fourth Session presentations

“Pet Buddy project” by Mag. Gudrun Braun (Tierschutz macht Schule)

The idea of the „Pet Buddy project“ is to give children and youth a practical experience of animal welfare. Teachers have the possibility to book the course for their school classes. On two days they visit an animal shelter and the “pets area” of the Vienna Zoological Garden, where they learn about the needs and behaviour of pets. Key messages about animal welfare are communicated and the children also learn how to pass on their knowledge about animal welfare to others.
“Animal Welfare in school lessons” by BED Judith Breinbauer

In this presentation the participants received practical insights from BED Judith Breinbauer, who herself is a Biology and English teacher at a secondary school. She explained the effects that animal welfare education has and gave some examples of her own teaching and the projects that she does with the children.

“How are animal welfare teaching materials made?”
by Mag. Daniela Lipka (Tierschutz macht Schule)

In this presentation Mag. Daniela Lipka, who writes all the teaching materials from „Tierschutz macht Schule“ in cooperation with experts, shared her didactic knowledge about methods and “tricks” how to best communicate the message of animal welfare. She recommended the use of mascots in teaching materials for children and youth. The mascots act as “friends” for the children, who speak their language and can communicate sometimes sad or complicated matters in an age appropriate way.

4.1. Fourth Session group work and discussion

In this interactive session two groups worked on two questions with the following results.

**Questions 1: How can we get more Animal Welfare into the schools?**

- More cooperation between actors
- Information systems/communication
- Get into curriculum of all subjects (redefine and more precise)
- E-learning-programs for teachers
- Accreditation of material
- Ways to implement in every school life
- Guest speakers (farmers, NGOs)
- More incentives → life experience
- EDUHI (Education Highway → platform, network)
- Teacher education (in PÄDAK = pedagogical college)

**Question 2: How can we evaluate/measure the effect of AW lessons?**

**Whom to evaluate?**

- Teachers
- Lessons or methods
- The outcome
- TOOLS: (case-control, intervention before – after)

**Measure the effect in short term?**

- Speaking about animals
- Handling Teddy-bears
- Fun
- TOOLS: fun role plays, drawings

**Measure the effect in long term?**
1. Facts/Information (COGNITIVE)
2. Behavioural change of kids and of family! (AFFECTIVE)
   TOOLS: tests, pictures, exposure to real life situation

5. Fifth Session presentations

“Criteria for a successful Animal Welfare Education”
by Mag. Marie-Helene Scheib (Tierschutz macht Schule)

Mag. Marie-Helene Scheib showed some factors which are necessary for the success of Animal Welfare Education such as:
- A diverse network
- The ability to exchange experiences
- Definition of quality criteria
- Cooperations with experts and scientists
- The media (especially social media when it comes to younger target groups)
- PR in order to reach the public
- Backup by the official sector

During her presentation Mag. Marie-Helene Scheib also presented a draft for Animal Welfare Education Quality Criteria, which was elaborated during an expert workshop of Tierschutz macht Schule in cooperation with DG SANCO, the Austrian Federal Ministry of Health and the Erna-Graff-Foundation in May 2010.

“European Animal Welfare Education – quo vadis?”
by DI Monika Hametter (Tierschutz macht Schule)

In the last presentation of the workshop the participants received an overview about the actions of “Tierschutz macht Schule” on a European level. The association has been advocating the importance of Animal Welfare Education over years as well as collaborating with other Non-profit-organisations and European institutions.

DI Monika Hametter showed the present or planned measures/projects related to Animal Welfare Education on the EU level and made some conclusions about possible further steps such as e.g. to include Animal Welfare Education for children and the youth in a possible Animal Welfare Framework Law or to establish an Animal Welfare Education Reference Centre.

The workshop ended at 5.30 pm with a summary of the day and final words.
Presentations

“European Animal Welfare Education- quo vadis?” by DI Monika Hametter (Tierschutz macht Schule)

Content

1. Activities of „Tierschutz macht Schule“ on the European level
2. European „Status quo“
3. Quo vadis?

Activities of „Tierschutz macht Schule“

- Brussels, August 2008: Presentation of AWE concept to DG SANCO
- Vienna, May 2010: International Workshop about Quality Standards in European AWE in cooperation with DG SANCO
- Brussels, October 2010: First International Conference about AWE in Brussels (about 400 participants)

Activities of „Tierschutz macht Schule“

- Brussels, March 2013: Member of EUA/WeFet advisory board
- Vienna, June 2013: Workshop about possible benefits of AWE Reference Centres
- Strasbourg, November 2013: Presentation about the idea of an AWE Reference Centre at the European Parliament’s Intergroup on the Welfare and Conservation of Animals

EU Animal Welfare Education Reference Centre

- AWE for children, youth and consumers
- Provide expertise about how to facilitate AWE in all member states
- Encourage the creation of national AWE providers
- Collect best-practice examples
- Elaborate quality criteria for AWE based on scientific facts
- Integrate AWE in the curriculum
- Coordinate research activities about AWE
- Provide a platform for exchanges
- Raise the awareness of AW in the society
- Enable animal friendly purchasing decisions
- Lay down the knowledge- and acceptance-basis for AW law in the society

European „Status quo“

„Players“

- European Commission
- European Parliament
- Member states and ministries
- Stakeholders like e.g.: NGOs, farming associations, universities or other research institutions, industry
- etc.
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European „Status quo“

„Field“:
- Laws or directives
- Curricula
- Conferences
- Expert groups
- Research projects
- Initiatives
- Etc.


- Emphasizes that knowledge-transfer is a crucial condition for successfully implemented animal welfare
- Need for informed consumers who will make their purchasing decision according to animal welfare criteria

Research projects

EDUCAWEL
Study on Education and Information Activities on Animal Welfare

EUWelNet
Coordinated European Animal Welfare Network

... evaluate the feasibility and usefulness of a network that could assist the competent authorities and stakeholders in implementing EU legislation on animal welfare
Source: www.euwelnet.eu

Legal frame

Proposal for a Regulation on official controls [...] to ensure the application of rules on animal health and welfare 2013/0140

Proposal for a European Animal Welfare Framework Law based on 4 axes:
1. The use of animal welfare indicators
2. Information to consumers
3. A network of reference centres
4. Requirements for competence

Conclusions – Quo Vadis?

- At the moment many opportunities to foster AWE in different areas
- Lobbying for AWE needed
- Lifelong learning in professional sector further developed
- Creation of a European Animal Welfare Education Reference Centre?
- Integration of AWE for children and youth in a possible framework law?
- Build networks in all member states?
- Collaboration with European education sector (DG Education and member states)?

Thank you for listening
“Tierschutz macht Schule” (Association for Animal Welfare Education) by Mag. Marie-Helene Scheib (Tierschutz macht Schule)

In accordance with Art. 2 Animal Protection Act...

by biologists, vets, animal protection and husbandry experts, members of the Austrian Animal Welfare Council, animal welfare associations and members of the public.

Animal welfare education

... means sharing knowledge about animals’ needs and behaviour to promote sustainable animal welfare.
A successful track record

- Since 2008, 374,000 pupils have been using our educational magazines
- 2,200 Austrian schools regularly order our teaching materials
- More than 2,500 teachers have been taking part in our adult education programme on animal welfare
- Our network includes 45 institutions, organisations and NGOs; jointly we have developed around 20 animal welfare projects involving schools, zoos, pet owners, and livestock farmers

A successful track record

- We have established quality criteria for educational materials on animal welfare
- We have created a qualitative and quantitative database with addresses of over 5,000 schools
- TmS is part of a European animal welfare education network – passing on experiences

Key topics

- Pets and their needs
- Farm animals and organic farming
- Wild animals and encounters with humans
- Laboratory animals and their living conditions

Children and young people

- "Animal Pro" (Tierprofi) – educational magazines for schools on topics such as pets, farm animals, wild animals, laboratory animals and horses
- "Pet buddy goes to school" – workshops on farms, in zoos and animal shelters for children from 6+
- "Say hello to cow and co." (Sag Hallo zu Kuh und Co) – brochure on how to handle farm animals properly
- "Well-Ka-Hu-Ka-Meer-Flopp" – animal welfare programme for children from 6+

Programmes for children & young people

- Educational programmes for children and young people
- Workshops and activities on animal welfare
- Brochures and educational materials
- Collaborations with schools, zoos, and animal shelters

Programmes for children & young people

- Educational initiatives for children and young people
- Animal welfare projects involving schools, zoos, pet owners, and livestock farmers
- Network of institutions, organisations, and NGOs working on animal welfare
- Qualitative and quantitative database with addresses of over 5,000 schools
EDUCAWEL
FINAL REPORT

Animal Pro – Structure

- Cartoon icons
- Original habitat and behaviour
- Conclusions for keeping animals today
- Behaviour (language) and animal-friendly husbandry
- Interactive button

Animal Pro: Laboratory animals

Animal Pro – Laboratory animals
(Tierprofi – Versuchstiere)
Animals used for research purposes: can we improve their living conditions – are there alternatives?

Educational materials for teenagers aged 14 to 18 and prospective students

NEW: Children’s magazine: Cats

"Understanding cats with the Well-Ka-Hu-Ka-Meer-Plopp" for children from 5+

Exciting facts on keeping cats, animal shelters and proper care for cats

Quality control

- Evaluation study in cooperation with the University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences in Vienna
- Pilot study with school children in Mexico
- Evaluation of our workshops by Austrian teacher training colleges/universities and the Federal Ministry for Education, Arts and Culture
- Telephone survey of teachers regarding the use of our educational materials

Adult education programmes

- Brochures on the relationship between humans and animals
- Teacher training workshops on animal welfare
- Toolboxes for teachers, including DVDs, learning stations, brochures and animal welfare games
- Practical courses for parents, pet and livestock owners and interested parties
- Knowledge portal for adults and for children
**Course for teachers**

"Tierschutz macht Schule" - course offered in cooperation with the teacher training colleges/universities of Upper Austria and Vienna

- 4 modules
- Topics: theory and practice of animal welfare education, animal protection law, ethics, international projects and organisations

**Animal welfare lecturers**

- Teach animal welfare in 8 federal states
- In schools, nurseries, and teacher training colleges
- Bookings and information on [www.tierschutzmachtschule.at](http://www.tierschutzmachtschule.at)

**Adult education programmes**

**NEW: Brochure on grazing cattle**

- In cooperation with the Federal Ministry of Health and the advisory board of "Tierschutz macht Schule" (TmS)
- Rules for meeting grazing animals
- Fun puzzles and quizzes for the whole family
- Cattle etiquette: respect animals' space!

**Press and public relations**

- Press conferences, trade fairs, exhibitions, campaign days in schools
- School competitions
- Homepage
- TV, radio, print media

**VISION**

- Handling and caring for animals based on respect for our fellow creatures
- Consumption of animal products based on animal welfare considerations
- Integrated EU-wide animal welfare education based on defined quality criteria, beginning in nursery schools
- Humans caring for animals according to their needs
“Enabling consumers to make an animal friendly purchasing decision” (by Toni Hubmann, presented by Christiane Obereder-Nazar both Toni’s Freilandeier)

Enabling consumers to make an animal friendly purchasing decision

Christiane Obereder-Nazar
Toni Hubmann

December 2013

Agenda

- To make consumers aware of what animal needs for a species-appropriate life are
  - Explained in an easy way to raise awareness for this issue
- To led children toward a sustainable consumption and to show alternatives
  - On the school sector where we have prepared material for parents and children
- To show consumers with an appropriate labelling a variety of choices
  - Clearly and precise presented and scientifically proven

Clear, accurate information for consumers

Consumers’ growing interest in how animals are treated on farms and in livestock facilities has created a strong demand for better information.

For this information to work, however, it needs to be transparent and backed by scientific facts – to protect consumers from misleading claims.

It also needs to be easily accessible and understandable. Many individual EU countries have their own animal welfare information programmes.

The European Commission plans to study these ongoing efforts and, if needed, will help to fill any information gaps.
Housing Condition Score

- The keeping system will be divided into 5 stages:

Assessment table I: Locomotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>columns</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>row</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment table II: Social interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>columns</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>row</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment protocol of welfare criterias

- Focus especially on aspects of animal welfare, that are not covered in parameters
- Limited to an overviewable amount of clear indicators.
Animal related indicators

- Peak cupping
- Quality of feed and free-range area
- Physical state, behavior, and animal health (welfare quality indicators)
- Breeding of the young hens
- Catching and transportation of the laying hens
- Slaughtering of the laying hens

Assessment animal related indicators

The result of standards and individual animal welfare conditions

- The red and blue indicators as a result of an objective evaluation of (subjective or emotional) animal welfare standards.
- The Housing Condition Score (HCS) is only an initiative, but with a scientific background. We need to be clear about one thing:
  - Animal welfare, sustainability will have an increasingly important role and determine the market.

Final result in comparison to the reference model

Livestock Welfare Labeling

Comparison of standards/Conclusion

1. The evaluation system makes it easy to understand why one standard achieves more evaluation points in comparison to another quality standard.

2. The total result and evaluation enable standard owners to revise their criteria with regard to animal welfare parameters/indicators.

3. The result explains how many points the standard achieved with regard to animal welfare parameters compared to the legal requirements on the basis of the reference model.

4. Consumers can see the extent to which animal welfare is respected in livestock farming.

5. Control and acquisition of the delivery quantities are crucial to ensure that what is produced under strict animal welfare requirements actually reaches consumers.
Animal welfare is knowledge!
The earlier children learn to know the right way to deal with pets, the easier it will apply to share their knowledge.

How do I become a Pet Buddy?

Training as a Pet Buddy will offer children the opportunity to gain knowledge about animal welfare and pet animals and to pass this knowledge on to friends, family and teachers.

Simultaneously, the training strengthens the self-confidence of the children and awareness of their own abilities.

Target group
Children 8-15 years.
**Aims of the training:**

A Pet Buddy:

* has compassion for the weak and occurs for them (whether for humans or for animals).
* knows how to avoid many accidents with animals.
* knows the most important texts of the Animal Welfare Act.
* passes the knowledge on animal welfare to others.

**Structure of training**

The training takes place in two stages:

Shelter of Vienna

Zoological Garden Schönbrunn

---

**What are the benefits of the training to Pet Buddy in Vienna's animal shelter and hold at the Zoo?**

The children learn in Vienna's animal shelter, what happens when you do not properly care for animals. Through direct contact with the animals living there, they can build a personal bond. This animal welfare becomes tangible and remains not only abstract knowledge.

In the Zoo petpark, the children learn that animals are not toys but living beings with different needs. The children learn the needs of the animals and know the mindful and respectful relationship with them.

---

**Level 1: Location: Vienna animal shelter**

**Contents:**

Interact behaviors of dogs and cats properly and learn the correct handling of dogs and cats. Knowing the needs of both species and know how the coexistence between humans and animals can easily run off.
**Focus**

Dogs

1. A tail-wagging dog is not automatically a friendly dog
2. Do not bend over a dog or pet it
3. Extreme caution with food and toys

Cats

1. No tilt windows
2. Cat litter boxes per bed
3. Do not place water bowl and food bowl next to each other

**Level 2: Location:** Zoological Garden Schönbrunn / pet park

**Contents:**

The children learn how to deal with guinea pigs, rabbits, budgies and other pet animals. Important topics such as proper feeding, careful handling of small animals, and also the question of the rights of animals to their environment, introduced in a playful way. True to the motto “Animal welfare can be fun!”

---

**Focus**

1. Keep guinea pigs and rabbits always in pairs
2. If rabbits and guinea pigs are in free range in summer be aware of enough shade
3. Guinea pigs and rabbits have different communication
4. Repeat: “It is NOT COOL!”
5. A zoo has the task to preserve some animal species from extinction

---

**Degree**

After successfully completed the Pet Buddy training the children receive a certificate, a button and a poster.

---

**Challenge**

- Pet buddy – pet buddy goes to school
- Children were cared for, by too many different people
- Too few receptions
- Too less animal welfare

**Success**

- The children love to become a Pet Buddy and are very interested during the training
- Teacher enjoy it, that they don’t have to do the animal welfare education by themselves
- We are fully booked until autumn 2014
Goals for the future
* Pet Buddy courses all over Austria
* new additional days to offer, with theme components following the offered booklets from animal welfare at school, for example: experimental animals

Thank you for listening!
"Practical teaching experiences in animal welfare from the University for Veterinary Medicine Vienna" by Prof. Dr. Josef Troxler (University of Veterinary Medicine Vienna)

Teaching Experiences in Animal Welfare from the vetmeduni vienna

Prof. Dr. Josef Troxler

Department for Clinics Farm Animals and Veterinary Public Health
Institute for Animal Husbandry and Animal Welfare

Teaching

- Teaching of students
- Postgraduate educations official vets and other stakeholders

Content:
- Housing systems and types of production in farm animals
- Behaviour and husbandry systems
- Welfare and health
- Human-animal relationship
- Animal protection law and ethics in animal protection

Areas of study

- Basics in domestic animals, handling of farm animals
- Behaviour of farm animals, horses, dogs and cats
- Housing systems and animal protection law
- Welfare indicators, excursions
- Clinical Welfare indicators, pain schemes
- Special modules: companion animals, horses

Sponsors:
- Farm animals: blood health management
- Veterinary Public Health (VPH)

experiences

- Red line as a good system, not only one lecture in animal welfare, but also integrated in clinical and heard health disciplines
- Excursions as a very important part for practice
- Good acceptance in the university and by students
- Students as vets in the future are the multipliers for animal welfare (public, farmers etc.)

Goals

- Behaviour of farm animals, horses and pets
- Understanding the interactions between animal and environment
- Capacity of adaptation of animals
- Welfare Indicators (behaviour, injuries etc.)
- Knowledge of animal housing systems, including management and climate conditions
- Understanding the relation between health and environment factors
- Animal welfare as a part of preventive medicine
- Animal welfare as a part of food quality

cooperation

- University of natural resources and life science (BOKU, Vienna)
- IMHAI (Interdisciplinary Master in Human-Animal Interactions) at Mesoeri research Institute
- Post graduate courses for vets in cooperation with ministry of health (BMG)
"The view of the Austrian public about Animal Welfare in agriculture and products" by Dr. Erik Schmid (Specialist Veterinarian Animal Husbandry and Animal Welfare)

The view of the Austrian public about Animal Welfare in agriculture and products

Erik Schmid, Specialist Veterinarian Animal Husbandry and Animal Welfare

Summary

- Study Thünen-Institute, Germany: Expectations of Society on Agriculture
- Survey in Vorarlberg: Interviews
- Labelling, education, information
- Responsibility: producer, market, consumer?
- Perception of Animal Welfare: farmers and society
- Human Animal Relationship: schizophrenic?

Expectations of society on agriculture

- Study Thünen-Institute presented at EurSAFE 2013
- Group discussion and online-questionnaire (n 1519)
  - Change of agricultural structure, pig-production, bio-fuel
  - Cluster analysis
  - Expectations, responsibility for "better" agriculture
  - Options of action for economics, politics and consumers

Results pig-production, cluster analysis: 3 types

- Opponents 28%
  - Strongly criticizing husbandry and farmers
  - Low acceptance of existing system
  - High expectations on action of government, consumers
- Moderates 25%
  - Moderate in criticism and acceptance
- Tolerants 37%
  - Opposite of opponents
  - No supporters of system, rather more resigning

Characterising types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Opponents</th>
<th>Modernists</th>
<th>Tolerants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>rather male</td>
<td>rather male</td>
<td>rather male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>average or good</td>
<td>rather poor</td>
<td>rather poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main responsibility</td>
<td>consumer, politics</td>
<td>producer, trade</td>
<td>producer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>rather (very) high</td>
<td>low and very high</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendations

- Segmentation of market: go for organic
- Communication of farmer (individual) to public
- Communication of farmers (interest) group
- Less intensive production systems
  - More space for animals, free range systems
  - No (prophylactic) use of antibiotics
  - No mutilation (castration, tail docking)
- Less money for big farms, EIP (Europe Innovation Partnership)
- New perspectives DARA (german agricultural research alliance)
Interview survey in Vorarlberg

- 52 personal interviews questionnaire
- Corresponding results to Thürner study
- Feeling of high responsibility for animals
- Average knowledge about animal husbandry
- Different treatment (moral status) pets/farm animals
- Due to estrangement from nature, lack of knowledge
- Labelling of products is important (like in eggs)

Labelling, education, information

- "Meat agriculture" educational project High school
- Farm visits and discussions
- Labelling concept for pork and beef
- Two levels above conventional, like in eggs
- Conventional, basic animal friendly, high standard
- Slatted floor, no slatted floor, free range
- Corresponding to welfare-label of FOUR PAWS

Responsibility

- Producer = farmer
- Trade = food industry, retailer
- Consumer: purchasing, citizen: tax-payer
- Morphological matrix of Günther Ropohl
- Ethical matrix CIWF
- S. Aerts: The consumer does not exist: overcoming the citizen/consumer paradox by shifting focus;
  "if it’s not there, the consumer won’t buy it" (The ethics of consumption p 172-176)

Perception of Animal Welfare

- Different perception of AW in farmers and consumers
- Farmers think technically (cell counts)
- Consumers feeling emotions
- Pictures don’t fit together: modern vs. traditional
- Expectations totally different
- Communication almost impossible

Perception of Animal Welfare

- Criteria assessing AW: What do you think “important”
  - stable, housing
  - management
  - animal health
  - animal behaviour
- Asking
  - farmers
  - pupils
  - consumers

assessment criteria animal welfare

- [Graph showing assessment criteria for animal welfare]
Human Animal Relationship

- Personalisation of pets as „partners“
- Anonymisation of farm animals as „products“
- Philosophicum in Lech 2012: „The animal itself: mankind and its nature“

Schizophrenic relationship? Konrad Paul Ließmann: „Cows sitting at the table the others on the plates“
An overview about Animal Welfare Education for professionals in Austria

Summary

- Farmers
- Transporteurs
- Slaughterhouse personnel
- Veterinarians and technicians
- Others: zoo personnel, pet shop personnel, research

- Legislation, requirements, certificates
- Courses, organisation
- Experience

Farmers

- Animal Welfare Act § 12 (1)
  - Legal obligation to have necessary knowledge...
- 1. Regulation Animal Husbandry § 3
  - Staff: necessary qualification and vocational knowledge for keeping animals, if
  - Appropriate academic or educational qualification
  - Farmer knows training, practical training, comparable qualification corresponding European standards
  - Plausible proof of capability to keep animals in practice

Self-evaluation

- Check-lists and manuals:
  - Cattle, small ruminants, pigs, horses...
  - Available on homepage of ministry of health BMC
- AIV regulations “translated” in simple yes/no-questions
- Detailed explanation, legal background, chart, draft
- Instruction of assessment: controls, advisors, designers
- Recommendation for higher standards (above minimum)
- Free for everybody
- Mandatory for participants in Animal Health Service AHS

Voluntary qualification

- Animal Health Service AHS
  - Special education including use of drugs and AIV
  - Basic course 8 hours, followed by 4 hours every 4 years
  - Content focus: animal health organised by farmers association
  - Cost sharing, public funding (more in urban, less in rural areas)
- Good cooperation with vocational edu organs (LFI)
- Additional private market: organic farmers
- „Stable schools“ exchange of experience, one hosting
- Vocational schools 3 year master craftsman, 5 year qualification for university, focus on production/economic
Transporteurs
- Transport Regulation specific act
  - not part of AVI Act, follows EU-Regulation 1/2012
- Mandatory education courses for professional transporteurs
  - 8 hrs theory + 4 hrs for long distance, 60 hrs practice
  - certificate (license) withdrawn in case of infringement
- Reduced requirements for farmers < 65 km, booklet LFI
- Self-evaluation: homologue BMG
- Voluntary qualification: Quality Handling®, e-learning
- Additional courses: cow-Whisperers, Low Stress Stewardship

Slaughterhouse personnel
- Specific Regulation in AW-Act; AW-Slaughter-Regulation
- Mandatory expert knowledge for professionals/assistants
  - Annex 1: detailed requirements in calming, stunning, killing
  - Basic skills in anatomy, physiology, behaviour, law, technique
- Routine yearly control and checking by official vets
  - including participation in training courses
- Guidelines AW in slaughter DMG, information sheet TVT
- Internal education of staff:
  - Quality Control, risk assessment, labeling (humane slaughter)

Veterinarians
- Specific vet med association profession code of conduct
- ÖTK official body/organisation; mandatory membership
- AW „moral obligation“ of profession
- Veterinarian as advocate of animals
- First aid requirement also for abandoned animals
- Obligatory educational training courses for vets in AHS
- Central registration of all post graduate courses
  - 20 hrs basic course to get own licensed pharmacy
  - 30 hrs every 2 years for vets in AHS, focus AH and drugs

Veterinarians
- Specialisation: Specialist in Animal Husbandry and AW
- Institutional commission and exam (scientific standard)
- Few graduates, no added value, one member ECAWDM
- Conflict of interest in practitioners (action against customer)
- ÖTK own institution for education: Vetak (Yet Academy)
- Official vets executing body in AW
  - representative and consultant of competent authority
  - specific training course BMO, modular (e.g., food science, AW)
  - A week, final exam; voluntary training courses every year
- 2010 Asa Vets for AW; yearly conference, voluntary (TVT)

Technicians
- Very few technicians; restrictive Veterinary Act
  - Farmers for artificial insemination (mainly own farm)
  - Edu courses few hours, organised by breeders association
  - Focus on practical procedure
- „Traditional“ interventions without any vocational training
  - castration of pigs, castrating calves (without anaesthesia)
  - alternative offer within AHS
  - vet applicable sedation and local anaesthesia
  - farmer does following practical intervention

Others
- Specific regulation for animals kept in business premises
  - e.g. pet shop; special knowledge to be confirmed
- Course of instruction of personnel
- Curriculum published by BMG
- Mandatory information for customers about animals needs
- Quality of education poor, commercial interests dominant
- Problem exotic animals: lacking awareness, instruction sheet
- Massive deficit in enforcement of registration of comwins
- Approval lawsuit necessary before purchasing animal
Others

- Breeders (all) also have to register
  - no specific requirement of qualification: large "black market"
- Specific regulation for 2005, circus, events with animals
  - all need registration or license by competent authority
  - extra qualification for zoo personnel (scientific core category)
  - official control every year
- Specific regulation for training of dogs
  - avoidance of pressure/punishment, learning principles/motivation
  - extra certificate as "AW-qualified dog trainer"
  - exam (theory and practice) national commission Meister-Institute
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### Appendix 25: Analysis of the educational systems

#### Analysis of the educational system in Greece

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compulsory education (6-15 years old)</th>
<th>Non compulsory education (15+)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary education - Compulsory (Primary school)</td>
<td>6th year</td>
<td>Literature, Greek, Art/aesthetic studies, Mathematics, Environmental studies, Music, Physical education, Religion, History, Foreign languages (English, French, German), Geography, Civics and social studies, Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th year</td>
<td>Mathematics, Environmental studies, Music, Physical education, Religion, History, Foreign languages (English, French, German), Geography, Civics and social studies, Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>6-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td>4-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRE-School</td>
<td>2-2.5/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Secondary education – Compulsory (Junior High School)</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>Foreign languages (English, French, German), Art/aesthetic studies, Ancient Greek, History, Biology, Geology-Geography, Religion, Ancient Greek Literature, Modern Greek Literature, Mathematics, Modern Greek, Home economics, Computer studies, Technology studies, Physics, Physical education, Chemistry, Civics and social studies, Vocational guidance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>14-15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>13-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Secondary education – Non compulsory (High School)</td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td>Algebra, Ancient Greek Literature, Economics, Biology, Composition, Research projects, Geometry, Religion, History, Modern Greek Literature, Physics, Chemistry, Philosophy, Computer studies, Latin, Mathematics, European Literature, Politics and Law, Technology, Religion, Accounting, Business Administration studies, Architectural design, Biochemistry, Art history, Sociology, Logic, Multimedia, Statistics, Agriculture studies, Physical education (not all subjects are compulsory)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st year</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Secondary education – Non compulsory (Technical Vocational educational school)</td>
<td>Lasts two or three years</td>
<td>Religion, Modern Greek, Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Physical education, Foreign language, Computer studies, History, Research projects, Modern Greek Literature, Composition, Economics, Biology, Technology, Design, European Union studies, Nautical studies, Statistics, Natural resource management, Engineering studies etc depending on the vocation (not all subjects are compulsory)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Note:** This table provides a summary of the educational system in Greece, outlining the compulsory and non-compulsory education levels, with specified years and subjects included in the curriculum. The table is presented in a logical format to facilitate easy understanding of the structure and content of the educational system.
## Analysis of the Educational System in Italy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Type of School/Institution</th>
<th>Subject Areas</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education (14-18)</strong></td>
<td>High school or Vocational Technical Institutions</td>
<td>Scientific-Technological, Humanities and Social Science, Arts and Technical school</td>
<td>14-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education (14-18)</strong></td>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>Technological, Scientific and Humanistic matters</td>
<td>11-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education (14-18)</strong></td>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>Not compulsory</td>
<td>6-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education (14-18)</strong></td>
<td>Infantile Education</td>
<td>Cohabitation and play interactions with other children, and preparation for the first cycle of education.</td>
<td>3-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Analysis of the Educational System in Lithuania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Vocational Education Type</th>
<th>Subject Areas</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Education</strong></td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>Art, business and administration, computer science, engineering and engineering professions, manufacturing and processing, architecture and construction, agriculture, forestry and fisheries, health care, social services, services to individuals, transportation services.</td>
<td>From 14 3-year education 1-2 years course 3-4 year course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Education</strong></td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Education</strong></td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vocational Education</strong></td>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Education</strong></td>
<td>4th year</td>
<td>moral education (religion or ethics), the Lithuanian language, two foreign languages, mathematics, nature and man, biology, physics, chemistry, history, civics, geography, art, music, crafts and physical training</td>
<td>15-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Education</strong></td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td></td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Education</strong></td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td></td>
<td>13-14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Education</strong></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td></td>
<td>12-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary and Lower Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>4th year</td>
<td></td>
<td>9-10/11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary and Lower Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>3rd year</td>
<td></td>
<td>8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary and Lower Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>2nd year</td>
<td></td>
<td>7-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary and Lower Secondary School</strong></td>
<td>1st year</td>
<td></td>
<td>5/6*-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-school</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Analysis of the Educational System in Poland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Subject Areas</th>
<th>Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education (13-16)</strong></td>
<td>Middle School/Junior High/secondary school/Gymnasium</td>
<td>Polish language, History, Civic education, Modern Foreign Language, Mathematics, Physics and astronomy, Chemistry, Biology, Geography, fine art, Music, Technology, Computer studies, Physical education, Religion/Ethics  &quot;Educational paths&quot; are introduced at this level**</td>
<td>13-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Education (6-13)</strong></td>
<td>Formal education</td>
<td></td>
<td>6-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basic Education (6-13)</strong></td>
<td>Kindergarten</td>
<td></td>
<td>5-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis of the educational system in Romania

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High school or vocational education</th>
<th>Mathematics, Romanian Language, History, Geography, two foreign languages (generally English, French, German, Italian, Spanish), Science, Art, Introduction to computers, Music, Physical Education and Civic Education, Physics, Chemistry, Biology.</th>
<th>15-19/20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Primary school (4 grades)          | **Gymnasium**  
  Grades V-VIII  
  Additional subjects from this grade onwards: Biology, Physics, Chemistry, Latin and Technology. Some subjects, like Religion and Technology may from now on be optional | 11-15     |
| Elementary school                   | **Elementary school**  
  Grades I-IV  
  Primary subjects include Math, Romanian Language, History, Geography, Science, Art, and Introduction to computers, Religion, Music, Physical Education and Civic Education. | 7-11      |
| Kindergarten                        | | 3-7       |

## Analysis of the educational system in Spain

| Baccalaureate                      | 2nd level  
  1st level | 2nd level; to choose: Biology and Geology, Physics and chemistry, Music, Latin, technology and plastic and visual arts, and also a 2nd language, Religion and History and culture of religions; optional subjects Scientific-Technological, Humanities and Social Science, Arts and Technical school | 16-18     |
|-----------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Secondary school                  | 4th level  
  3rd level  
  2nd level  
  1st level | Technological, Scientific and Humanistic Itineraries | 12-15     |
| Primary school                    | 3rd cycle  
  2nd cycle  
  1st cycle | | 10-12     |
| Infantile Education               | | | 8-10      |
| PRE-School                        | | | 6-8       |
| Kindergarten                      | | | 3-6       |
| Infantile Education               | | | 0-3       |
### Analysis of the educational system in Sweden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Education (14-18)</strong></td>
<td>High school or Secondary education (I)</td>
<td>English, history, physical education and health, mathematics, science studies, social studies, Swedish or Swedish as a second language and religion. A number of subjects specific to a given programme are chosen. Diploma project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Education (5-13)</strong></td>
<td>Primary basic education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-school class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-school</td>
<td>Not compulsory. Cohabitation and play interactions with other children, and preparation for the first cycle of education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Analysis of the educational system in UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Year(s)</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Upper School or Secondary School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students choose 10 subjects to study in detail. Some are compulsory: English, Mathematics and Science. The rest are options such as Engineering or Business Studies, to be chosen by the students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 10-Key stage 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle School, High School or Secondary School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>English, Mathematics, Science (Physics, Chemistry and Biology), History, Geography, Languages, ICT (Information and Computer Technology), Religious Education, Physical Education, Music, Drama, Art, Design &amp; Technology (covering such topics as woodworking, metalwork, cookery, textiles etc.) and PHSE (Personal, Social and Health Education).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 9***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7-Key stage 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Junior School or Primary School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>English, Mathematics, Science (Physics, Chemistry and Biology), History, Geography, Languages, ICT (Information and Computer Technology), Religious Education, Physical Education, Music, Drama, Art, Design &amp; Technology (covering such topics as woodworking, metalwork, cookery, textiles etc.) and PHSE (Personal, Social and Health Education).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 6**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 3-Key stage 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infant School or Primary School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception-Key stage 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kindergarten</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nursery School</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From 3/4 to 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 26: Analysis of the educational system in Austria

OVERVIEW RESEARCH REPORT

“Information about current education and information activities.
   Education in secondary schools.”

Content of research

1. How many hours per year/course have to be dedicated to animal welfare issues in secondary schools?
2. Under which modules or subjects is AW included in the programs?
3. Does teaching include practical experience?
4. Are there differences between schools?
5. Who decides the scholar program and therefore decides on this dedication to Animal Welfare?
6. Do some of these initiatives include involving parents or other relatives?
1. How many hours per year/course that have to be dedicated to animal welfare issues in secondary schools.

There are two different ways how animal welfare is formally integrated into the curricula in Austria. However, there is not a specified amount of hours per year which the teachers have to dedicate to it. Animal welfare is mentioned in a teaching principle and in some curricula (see point 2) which means that the teachers have to cover this issue but they are free to decide how they teach it and how much time they dedicate to it. For example: teaching about farm animals in the year 8 with a standard school-book would take up to four or five lessons.

It can be said that the amount of teaching hours depends highly on the personal motivation of the teacher and the way she or he designs the lessons.

Generally “Animal welfare” is more of an issue in lower grades, whereas higher grades tend to have single projects about animal welfare issues.

2. Under which modules or subjects is AW included in the programs?

First there is a teaching principle called “Environmental Education”. A teaching principle should be followed in all teaching subjects. The teaching principle “Environmental Education” includes paragraphs about the importance of fostering the idea of animal welfare, providing interaction and personal experiences with animals. It further encourages to deepen the understanding of animal welfare and also to take into consideration the “World Animal Welfare Day” when doing project work in class.

In the curricula for primary education (age 6 to 10 years) concerning the subject “Sachunterricht” the word “animal welfare” is mentioned under the paragraphs: “To understand the human relation with nature” and “To recognize the importance of plants and animals for our living-environment (plant- and animal welfare)”. In the curricula for secondary education (stage I, age 10 to 14 years) the term “Animal welfare” as such is not mentioned. However, the curriculum for the subject “Biology” includes the request to teach about pets in the first grade, and about farm animals in the third grade.

Again it depends on the teacher whether they present these topics in connection with animal welfare, or under the aspect of physiology and behaviour, etc.

In stage II of secondary education (age 14 to 19 years) the curriculum for Biology in Academic Secondary Schools includes “Animals and biodiversity” and “Animal breeding and genetic engineering.”

The term “Animal welfare” or “Animal Welfare Law” itself is for example mentioned in the curricula of the following vocational trainings:
- Meat processing
- Meat selling
- Blacksmith
- Stockman
- Agriculture

Apart from the curricular offers and the accredited school books there are also various offers from animal welfare organisations which provide teaching materials, workshops and excursions. “Tierschutz macht Schule” is an organisation specialized solely on animal welfare education.

3. Does teaching include practical experience?

Sachunterricht http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/14051/lp_vs_7_su.pdf
Biologie und Umweltkunde http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/11860/lp_neu_ahs_08.pdf
Lehrpläne Berufsschulen http://www.abc.benfbildendeschulen.at/de/download.asp?id=7&theme=Lehrpl%E4ne%3A+Berufsschulen
www.tierschutzmachtschule.at/en

64 Sachunterricht http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/14051/lp_vs_7_su.pdf
67 Lehrpläne Berufsschulen http://www.abc.benfbildendeschulen.at/de/download.asp?id=7&theme=Lehrpl%E4ne%3A+Berufsschulen
68 www.tierschutzmachtschule.at/en
This also depends on the way teachers prefer to design their lessons. The teachers are free to decide for example whether they want to organize a farm visit, or to take part in other initiatives, such as the “Pet buddy” program\(^69\) offered by Tierschutz macht Schule.

4. **Are there differences between schools?**

Looking at the whole Austrian education system, differences can be found, like for example between vocational schools and academic secondary schools *(see also point 2).*

Looking at academic secondary schools all over the country, the minimum requirements for animal welfare teaching are set in the curricula, but it can be confirmed that the animal welfare teaching is mainly dependent on the teachers themselves, and/or on the “culture” of the school. It is the teacher's choice whether they want to dedicate time to that and of course they have to ask for permission from the headmaster if they want to involve their classes in “special” activities; but whether they e.g. want to use specialized animal welfare teaching magazines (like e.g. the ones offered by Tierschutz macht Schule) in their lessons, is their free choice. The incentive to teach about animal welfare definitely varies significantly amongst teachers. As mentioned previously other factors, such as the type of school, local resources or cultural aspects may also have an effect on this.

*Figure 1: The Austrian Education System\(^70\)*

So the curriculum is a guideline but in the end teachers can freely decide to which extent and how they present animal welfare issues to their pupils.

5. **Who decides the scholar program and therefore decides on this dedication to Animal Welfare?**


\(^70\) [http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/24501/bildungsweg_ian13_0122_fina.pdf](http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/24501/bildungsweg_ian13_0122_fina.pdf)
The Ministry of Education and Women’s Affairs decides about the scholar program.

6. Do some of these initiatives include involving parents or other relatives?

Parents are generally not much involved and if so rather in connection with younger children (lower grades). It can be that parents for example join excursions as supervisors. However, “Tierschutz macht Schule” receives the feedback from stakeholders (parents, teachers, etc) that the pupils pass on the knowledge they gain about animal welfare also to their parents and their brothers and sisters.
Appendix 27: Animal welfare course for teachers offered by the Association for AW Education

CASE STUDY REPORT

Animal welfare course for teachers offered by "Tierschutz macht Schule"

Content of research

7. Contextualization: Reason why this case study has been chosen
8. What has been done and how?
9. What impact did it have? Is it measurable? How?
10. Highlights (some aspects or curiosities of the case)
11. Conclusions
12. Recommendations: Could it be extrapolated to other uses/other countries and how?
1. Contextualization: Reason why this case study has been chosen

The animal welfare course for teachers provided by "Tierschut macht Schule" is a unique offering in the field of animal welfare education within Europe. In cooperation with Austrian teacher training colleges we provide training for practising teachers to become animal welfare instructors. The course entitles teachers to CPD (continuing professional development) credits. Animal welfare is therefore integrated into the state education system on a larger scale.

The course is a successful example for interdisciplinary animal welfare education and has a national impact. It brings together experts from different fields, including education, animal welfare, ethics, law and biology, and ensures subsequently that animal welfare education based on scientific fact is passed on to a wider public. The number of participants is increasing steadily. Course participants subsequently become key multipliers, offering animal welfare education at their own and other schools and therefore reaching a large group of children and young people.

2. What has been done and how?

Since its foundation the Association for Animal Welfare Education has provided various teaching materials and brochures about different animal welfare topics and educational methods to impart knowledge to children and young people. These teaching materials are proving very popular.

To ensure that these materials are commonly used and to support teachers in animal welfare education, "Tierschutz macht Schule" has created a course in conjunction with Austrian teacher training colleges to provide teachers with the opportunity to become animal welfare instructors. Course participants are entitled to 8 ETCS points for their continuing professional development (CPD).

Teachers are key multipliers who can pass on their knowledge to a wider audience through schools. Their educational training enables them to prepare topics in an engaging way appropriate for children of different ages. The aim of the course is to enable teachers to impart sound animal welfare knowledge based on current scientific research. During the course they will discuss and practise different teaching methods.

In two semesters and eleven weekends (16 teaching units each), participants learn about the behaviour, needs and husbandry requirements of pets, farm animals, horses, wild animals and laboratory animals. Topics such as animal welfare ethics and law as well as different educational tools are also an important part of the programme.

To complete the course, participants have to pass an exam with multiple choice questions and a practical element. The practical element consists of two teaching units, in which participants are required to teach a specific topic in two different school classes with children of different age groups.

We are in the fortunate position that leading experts and scientists support our course as lecturers, ensuring a very high standard of expertise throughout.

The first course was held in 2010/2011 and since we have completed three teacher training courses. A total of 43 participants have successfully completed the course.

3. What impact did it have? Is it measurable? How?

The course impacts immediately on participants, prompting them to use their newly acquired knowledge about animal keeping, animal welfare and ethics in their own lessons. The feedback from participants shows that teaching units on animal welfare are very popular with pupils in their own lessons or in supply teaching.
23 former participants are happy to carry on as "animal welfare instructors" and teach units suitable for specific age groups in other schools or to pass on their knowledge to colleagues in CPD courses for teachers.

"Tierschutz macht Schule" has established a separate page on their website71 to introduce animal welfare instructors and enable schools to book them directly. Schools are able to contact individual instructors via the website and to agree specific topics.

So far course participants have taught as animal welfare instructors in other schools on over 70 occasions. On average these animal welfare lessons consist of two teaching units each.

There is a strong demand for further courses, with more than 50 enquiries from interested teachers.

4. Highlights (some aspects or curiosities of the case)

The course is mainly attended by motivated and committed teachers. All of them are therefore very keen to pass on their newly acquired animal welfare knowledge. It is particularly encouraging to see how participants pick up on different issues and follow them up with in-depth questions.

A course highlight is certainly experiencing how participants put their knowledge into practice in schools in imaginative teaching units based on sound scientific facts.

It is also a great recognition of our work and the course that the federal minister responsible for animal welfare has taken the time to personally give out certificates to participants at a ceremony at the end of each course.

5. Conclusions

"Tierschutz macht Schule" is very proud to have established a course which is so well received and included as part of the recognised CPD offering for teachers at state educational institutions.

All participants were delighted with the course programme, which is reflected in the evaluations required by the teacher training colleges. A large number of participants is still in touch with "Tierschutz macht Schule".

The 27 animal welfare experts who contribute to the course with valuable input appreciate the programme immensely and support our association and the course in various ways.

Thanks to our intensive cooperation with teacher training colleges, animal welfare experts and course participants, we have also received valuable and positive input. The animal welfare units taught by participants in schools after completion of the course prove that they are able to put the acquired knowledge into practice in varied and imaginative ways.

Teachers also received didactic inputs on how to teach AW: how to design games, bring children in touch with nature, etc, and teachers already have a wide knowledge, so teaching strategies are a combination of all.

Our aspiration is to use this course to find better ways of imparting in-depth animal welfare knowledge in schools. The feedback we have received so far confirms the success of our work. Combined with our teaching magazines, we are able to offer schools a comprehensive package for varied and engaging animal welfare teaching units based on scientific fact.

71 http://www.tierschutzmachtschule.at/angebot/tierschutzreferentin-buchen.html
6. Recommendations: could it be extrapolated to other uses/other countries and how?

We believe that the course concept can be adapted and implemented successfully in other countries. Cooperation with public teacher training institutions is advisable to ensure that the course is recognised as an important part of CPD, even if this means that the bureaucratic requirements of the relevant institutions will have to be fulfilled.

One option would be to split the course and offer the content in different modules (for instance modules on pets, farm animals, wild animals, and laboratory animals etc.).

Experience has shown that, due to their full-time teaching commitment, the majority of teachers in Austria rarely have the time to offer animal welfare education in schools other than their own, in particular during normal school hours. Consequently, it is not possible to meet all the demand from schools.

A possible solution may be to extend the course target group to other professions with an educational background such as nursery or social education staff. This would also contribute to further dissemination of animal welfare knowledge.
Appendix 28: Animal welfare teaching magazines by the Association for AW Education

CASE STUDY REPORT

Animal welfare teaching magazines produced by
"Tierschutz macht Schule"
(Association for Animal Welfare Education)

Content of research

1. Contextualization: Reason why this case study has been chosen
2. What has been done and how?
3. What impact did it have? Is it measurable? How?
4. Highlights (some aspects or curiosities of the case)
5. Conclusions
6. Recommendations: Could it be extrapolated to other uses/other countries and how?
1. Contextualization: Reason why this case study has been chosen

Teaching magazines are the core educational resource offered by the Association for Animal Welfare Education "Tierschutz macht Schule". There has always been a high demand for fact-based teaching magazines suitable for different age groups from nursery to schools and universities. This is reflected by the large quantity of magazines ordered by Austrian schools (see section 3). Teaching magazines are also a perfect vehicle to convey condensed information sustainably within a short amount of time (see section 2).

2. What has been done and how?

The teaching magazines provide sound factual information based on current scientific research. "Tierschutz macht Schule" relies on a large community of well-known animal welfare experts and a scientific advisory board to offer input and review the materials during their conception. The success of these materials is largely due to the use of a language suitable for children and young people. All materials feature captivating and exciting stories, riddles and hands-on activities. The materials avoid using shocking or disturbing images as we believe they will be counterproductive. We offer positive solutions even for serious topics. Each teaching magazine features a cartoon character who encourages and guides children through the topic. This character appears throughout the magazine and creates a dramatic tension.

The materials’ aim is to introduce children to animals’ natural requirements and behaviour, conveying an understanding of animal-friendly husbandry. We want to instil and encourage a responsible and ethical treatment of animals based on respect, and our vision is to improve animals' living conditions. If children acquire animal welfare knowledge early, they can pass it on to their parents, relatives, friends and hopefully later to their own children. As our teaching materials introduce children to animal welfare issues at a very young age, starting in nurseries and schools, this information will spread into all levels of society. In this way it will become engrained into everyday life. In order to reach a maximum number of children and young people, we have created materials suitable for different age groups. Teachers can order class sets free of charge directly from "Tierschutz macht Schule", and schools will only have to pay postage for the magazines. All children will be able to take home and keep their own copy. The magazines are self-explanatory and can be used flexibly as an interdisciplinary teaching aid.

The list of teaching magazines includes:

**WELL-KA-HU-KA-MEER-PLOPP**, a series created specifically for primary schools: this series features a fantasy character, the WELL-KA-HU-KA-MEER-PLOPP, who can talk to both animals and humans. In each magazine the character has an adventure, showing children what animals need and expect from them.

- Understanding animals with the WELL-KA-HU-KA-MEER-PLOPP
- Understanding dogs with the WELL-KA-HU-KA-MEER-PLOPP
- Understanding laying hens with the WELL-KA-HU-KA-MEER-PLOPP
- Understanding cats with the WELL-KA-HU-KA-MEER-PLOPP

**Tierprofi (Animal Pro)**, a series suitable for children from age 8:

- Animal Pro – Pets (Tierprofi – Heimtiere): Understanding, keeping and caring for animals in the home, for children aged 8 to 13
- Animal Pro – Farm animals (Tierprofi – Nutztiere): From schnitzel to stable: Understanding the link between food and animals for children aged 8 to 13
- Animal Pro – Wild animals (Tierprofi – Wildtiere): From hedgehogs in the hedgerows to zebras in the zoo. How to handle wild animals properly for children up to age 14
• Animal Pro – Laboratory animals (Tierprofi – Versuchstiere): Animals used for research purposes. How can we improve their living conditions? Are there alternatives? for children and young people up to age 18

• Animal Pro – Horses (Tierprofi – Pferde): Horses through human history, wild horses, animal welfare with regard to horses and donkeys for children up to age 13

3. What impact did it have? Is it measurable? How?

The following figures illustrate the high demand for our animal welfare magazines: from 2008 to 2013 2,500 educational institutions ordered 376,738 teaching magazines from “Tierschutz macht Schule”.

With each order we enclose a feedback form, asking teachers to evaluate how the teaching materials were received in their class. We also receive feedback on the teaching magazines through teacher training courses. The University of Natural Resources and Life Sciences in Vienna helped us to evaluate the magazine Animal Pro – Farm animals (Tierprofi – Nutztiere). We also conducted a pilot study with pupils in Mexico which focused on a Spanish translation of Animal Pro – Farm animals (Tierprofi – Nutztiere). The strong positive feedback shows the level of interest from schools in the teaching materials. Teacher feedback tells us that our teaching magazines are very popular with the children and are read even after school hours in leisure time.

4. Highlights (some aspects or curiosities of the case)

The most popular teaching materials are magazines that fit well into the curriculum such as Animal Pro – Farm animals (Tierprofi – Nutztiere). The series WELL-KA-HU-KA-MEER-PLOPP is also hugely popular, particularly the magazine on cats, presumably because cats are the most popular pets in Austria.

Our interdisciplinary approach and the collaboration of a community of experts including scientists and practitioners contribute to the success of our materials. They support us on a voluntary basis.

We have found that the professional and child-centred graphics of our materials also contributes to their success. The participation of teachers is also vital to ensure the materials are suitable for schools.

Professional writers transform the facts into a lively, exciting and target-group specific language to allow pupils a creative approach to the topics.

In our experience both teachers and pupils largely prefer printed materials. They want to hold the magazines in their hands to work with them, to take them home and show them to family and friends. Magazines available only in a digital form do not go down as well. Downloadable files which replace the print magazines are hardly ever used.

5. Conclusions

The following conditions need to be fulfilled for a successful creation and distribution of teaching materials: A political will is required – animal welfare needs to be on the political agenda! The production of materials requires an animal welfare act which also includes provisions for animal welfare education. Financial resources need to be available. Public funding is a prerequisite for the complex and time-consuming production and printing of these magazines (time-to-market from conception to print around a year). Long-term funding needs to be secured. It makes sense to establish a network with the education authorities to reach schools in the best possible manner. A permanent public relations effort (media contacts) and an ongoing exchange with scientific institutions are also essential.
Based on all these prerequisites it is possible to establish an outstanding reputation as an internationally recognised animal welfare education organisation which forms the basis of sustainable animal welfare education.

Animal welfare education is a long-term process and a worthwhile investment to secure the well-being of animals and improve the relationship between humans and animals.

6. Recommendations: could it be extrapolated to other uses/other countries and how?

Our teaching magazines can be very useful, provided that the content is adapted as animal husbandry systems, animal welfare legislation and related issues differ between countries. Cultural differences and different approaches to animals also require country-specific adaptations to texts and stories.
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The main aim of work package 4 (WP4) is to build competence in animal welfare science through the development of the Animal Welfare Science Hub (www.animalwelfarehub.com) that integrates applied and fundamental aspects in animal welfare research and creates a long-lasting relationship with stakeholders. We maintain our relationship with our stakeholders and interested parties (farmers, veterinarians, university students, legislators, teachers and NGOs) by providing access to scientifically valid education and training. The outcomes generated in the research work packages (WP1, 2 and 3) are being used by WP4 to provide educational materials for learning and training.

Review of current teaching:

In WP4 we have reviewed every programme at university level that includes 25% or more of its teaching on animal welfare or closely related topics. This has not been an easy task due to the range and number of programmes available, for example there are 82 undergraduate and postgraduate animal welfare or associated topic programmes in the UK alone. Added to this is the challenge of programmes being in multiple languages. The design of the animal welfare science hub will overcome this difficulty as course organisers will be able to upload their course details and do this in their own language. The biggest challenge we faced in the review of teaching was that from non-university teaching, which was advertised on a more ad-hoc basis—especially teaching or training for either industry stakeholders or children and young people. Our solutions have included setting up stakeholder partnerships to understand the training already available.

Producing an active database of animal welfare courses:

After reviewing courses available, WP4 have listed courses related to any field of animal welfare and prepared them for efficient web browsing. Users of any level are able to search for courses that are being offered worldwide. They can find online or face-to-face courses locally and internationally, filter the search by species, target audience, price and time requirements of programmes. This section is unique in being global regarding geographical distribution, including programmes in national languages, for a wide range of possible audiences and still being user-friendly by different filter options and personal preferences. In this way students can benefit from the Hub by easily finding proper courses that they can attend from home when online or downloaded, or choose the most appropriate teaching program to apply for. On the other hand, teachers and course organisers have the opportunity on the Hub to advertise their online and
other courses. The advantage of this is that the list remains up to date as course organisers can edit the entries as courses evolve over time—in other words, a dynamic database as opposed to a static one. In cooperation with the International Society for Applied Ethology (ISAE) teaching programmes will be evaluated by objective expert panels based on their pedagogic and scientific value according to the intended audience.

Producing learning materials:

One of our main tasks within the AWIN project was to produce high quality, scientifically valid and educationally effective learning materials from the research WPs of the project. This involved training the researchers in thinking about dissemination opportunities before the science had even started. At every stage, we have had to help the researchers see the goal of producing clear and efficient learning materials, not just peer-review scientific journal articles. At this stage of the project, we have built over 50% of our learning deliverables to the evaluation stage, so it appears we have overcome this significant challenge with our AWIN colleagues. The evaluations will test user-friendliness and educational effectiveness, so far our interactive user-centred materials have scored well against more traditional methods of learning.

Engaging with stakeholders to provide a multi-topic learning on the AWS hub:

Our biggest challenge is to engage stakeholders with our vision of science-based online learning. We have been successful in interacting with stakeholders at government, non-government producer and veterinary association level, but translating this into users for the Animal Welfare Science Hub is more difficult. The potential for the Hub to provide multi-topic animal welfare learning free of charge to use online or download has been shown to be attractive to stakeholder groups—but like any new online tool, it requires constant feedback, updates and improvements to get it to work optimally. Constant improvements, promotion and interlinking with our Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn social media are now starting to show success as numbers using the hub are building. With every event we must use all of these tools available to us to continue to build numbers.

Provide training to PhD students involved with the project

Another aim of the AWIN project was to provide a state-of-the-art training environment for PhD students and early career Post-doctoral staff. Within WP4, we wanted to introduce the web-based environment to our students and early careers scientists. Although most of them were very web-savvy, only one of our students had participated in a webinar and none had presented in an online collaborative environment. For the last in as series of PhD/PD training workshops, WP4 provided an online webinar platform for students to present their work. Additionally, we used the webinar platform to discuss and debate three pertinent topics: stakeholder interaction, careers post-PhD and effective grant writing. Six students and three post-docs presented their work via the webinar. The workshop evaluation will be discussed.

Conclusion:

Moving information exchange to a web-based system allows for a more open, discursive and collaborative environment than using traditional resources. Our main challenge is to promote the use of ‘our’ environment (the Animal Welfare Science Hub) over the many others available online. Our next biggest challenge is to keep a user interested once they reach our platform. Having a substantial amount of high quality learning materials and an up-to-date list of specific learning courses is our attempt to combat these challenges as it is only through constant use of such web-resources that they survive and grow.