16 January 2020

EFSA Scientific opinions on the welfare of poultry: slaughter and killing for purposes other than slaughter

Yves Van der Stede

Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW) Animal and Plant Health (ALPHA) Unit



Trusted science for safe food

Outline



- General description of the mandates (background, request, animal species, adoption timeline, ToRs)
- Two Scientific opinions published November 2019:
 EFSA Scientific opinion on the slaughter of animals: poultry <u>https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5849</u>
 - EFSA Scientific opinion on the killing for purposes other than slaughter: poultry

https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5850



personnel. EFSA's advice highlights the importance of staff being adequately fill published: 09 Jan 2020 trained in the different phases of slaughter and for clear identification of roles and



Background on the subject

- Council Regulation (EC) No 1099/2009
- Previous EFSA Scientific outputs adopted in 2004, 2006, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2017
- Terrestrial Animal Health Code from **OIE revision of**:
 - Slaughter of animals (Chapter 7.5);
 - Killing of animals for disease control purposes (Chapter 7.6)

Request to EFSA in 2019:

To review the scientific literature and provide a sound scientific basis for future discussions at international level on the welfare of the animals in the context of slaughter and other types of killing



Animal species

Animals in containers (domestic birds and rabbits); pigs; cattle; 'other species' (buffalo, bison, sheep, goats, camelids, deer, horses, ratites)

Timeline for adoption: 10 Scientific opinions



- AW at slaughter

- AW during killing for purposes other than slaughter



Process steps to consider	ToRs
 Arrival Unloading Lairage Handling and moving (free moving animals only) Restraint Stunning (Stunning/killing) Bleeding Slaughter of pregnant animals Emergency killing (outside the normal slaughter line) Unacceptable methods on welfare grounds 	 ToR-1: Identify welfare hazards and their origins (in terms of facilities, equipment, staff) ToR-2: Define ABMs to assess performance on AW ToR-3: Provide preventive and corrective measures (structural or managerial) to address the hazards ToR-4: Point out specific hazards related to species or types of animals (e.g., young, with horns)











Scientific opinion on slaughter of animals: poultry

Adopted in September 2019

Published in November 2019 at: https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5849



Slaughter

Killing of poultry for human consumption that could take place in a slaughter plant or during on-farm slaughter,

from the arrival until the animal is dead, including slaughter without stunning (assessment of AW on the farm and during transport is excluded).



Poultry

Domestic birds as defined by the OIE, that can be put in crates and containers, such as chickens, turkeys, quails, ducks and geese, and game birds, (ratites-free moving animals are excluded)

Approach for mandates: conceptual model



Phases (and processes):

- 1- Pre-stunning (arrival, lairage, unloading, handling)
- 2- Stunning (electrical-, CAS-, mechanical-stunning methods (+restraint))
- 3- Bleeding (following stunning, during slaughter without stunning (+restraint))



Approach to the mandate: conceptual model



Phases (and processes):

- 1- Pre-stunning (arrival, lairage, unloading, handling)
- 2- Stunning (electrical-, CAS-, mechanical-stunning methods (+restraint))
- 3- Bleeding (following stunning, during slaughter without stunning (+restraint))



> development of outcome tables

- One outcome table for each process & overall assessment
- Summary of all retrieved information
- Main Results of the SO and main basis for Conclusions and Recommendations

Stunning methods included in the SO

- Electrical stunning methods (+ restraint):
 - 1. Waterbath
 - 2.Head-only
- **Controlled atmosphere stunning methods:**
 - **1**.Carbon dioxide in two phases
 - 2. Mixture of carbon dioxide with inert gases
 - **3.**Inert gases
 - 4.1 APS
- Mechanical stunning methods (+ restraint):
 - **1**.Captive bolt
 - 2. Percussive blow to the head
 - 3. Cervical dislocation
 - 4. Decapitation

ultiple waterbath stunning courtesy of L. Berg

Head-only electrical stunning, courtesy of L. Berg

Manual cervical dislocation, source: EC











`handling and removing of birds from crates or containers'

Table 12: Outcome table on 'handling and removing of birds from crates or containers': hazards (with the number of the section where the hazard's full description is provided), with relevant welfare consequences, ABMs, origin of hazards, and preventive and corrective measures

Hazard	Welfare consequence/s occurring to the birds due to the hazard	Hazard origin/s	Hazard origin specification	Preventive measure/s for hazard (implementation of SOP)	Corrective measure/s for the hazard
Rough handling of the birds during removal from the containers (3.6.1.9)	Pain, fear	Staff, facilities, equipment	Unskilled personnel; operator fatigue; high throughput rate, poorly designed containers (with small openings)	Staff trainingStaff rotationChange container systemSlow down the line speed	None
Tipping or dumping on conveyors (3.6.1.10)	Pain, fear	Staff, equipment	Poor handling; equipment poorly designed and constructed; speed of tilting birds; slow speed of reception belt	 Staff training Staff rotation Correct design and setting up of equipment 	Distribute birds evenly on the belt
Bunching on the conveyor belts (3.6.1.11)	Pain, fear	Equipment	Slow moving conveyor/fast transfer between conveyors	Correct design and setting up of the conveyor belt	Synchronise speed of the conveyor belt
ABMs: injuries, vocalisations, wing flapping, bunching					

ABM: animal-based measure; SOP: standard operating procedure.

RESULTS, CONCL, RECOM - GENERAL



- 35 hazards identified: 80% due to lack of skills and trained staff
 - All processes should be carried out by trained and skilled personnel
 - **Training of staff** / clear identification of roles and responsibilities
- For most hazards -> preventive measures can be put in place, whereas relevant corrective measures are not always available
 - **Priority** should be given to **preventive measures**.
 - When no measures to correct the hazard exist: mitigation of the welfare consequences should be put in place
- 10 welfare consequences identified:

	Conscious ness	Heat stress	Cold stress	Prolonged thirst	Prolonged hunger	Restriction of movements	Pain	Fear	Distress	Respiratory distress
Pre- stunnina		х	х	х	х	х	х	х		
Stunning	х						х	х		х
Bleeding	x						Х	Х	Х	

They can be the result of a single or several hazards

- AHAW Panel agrees with the principles of the OIE Terrestrial code regarding unacceptable methods ... examples of such methods are:
 - electroimmobilisation for neck-cutting or preventing wing flapping during bleeding,
 - brain piercing through the skull without prior stunning



- 11 Hazards, 10 linked to staff as origin: arrival, unloading, lairage and handling
- Welfare consequences might be results of hazards occurring on the farm and/or during transport
- Some welfare consequences have no Animal Based Measures (ABMS, e.g. prolonged thirst), and others have ABMs that are very difficult to assess while birds are inside the containers (e.g. fear).
- The welfare status of birds should be assessed and monitored at each phase of slaughter by assessing the ABMs. If the hazard is present and use of ABMs is not feasible, it's assumed that the welfare consequences are experienced by the birds.
- **Preventive and corrective actions**:
 - 1) maintenance of the physiology of the animals (ventilation, heat and cold stress)
 - 2) prevention/correction of hazards leading to **pain and fear** (handling birds)



- Number of hazards depend on the stunning method used:
 - Induction of unconsciousness (Controlled Atmosphere stunning);
 - Restraint of birds (electrical and mechanical stunning)
- Some hazards are inherent in the stunning method and cannot be avoided;
- Majority of Hazards mainly due to unskilled staff;
 - Prevention from recovering consciousness after stunning to avoid pain, fear and distress during bleeding;
 - All methods should allow monitoring for unconsciousness before the bleeding phase.
 - A back-up stunning method should be ready at all times to mitigate the welfare consequences;
- Hanging upside down is a physiologically abnormal posture for poultry
 - To prevent birds experiencing severe welfare consequences such as pain and fear animals should not be shackled while conscious



- In electrical water bath stunning, not all birds processed at the same time receive the same current.
 - For electrical water bath stunning of poultry, the parameters that should be used are reported in Table 2 of the opinion, except for broilers and turkeys for which the frequency should not exceed 600 Hz
- For 'expansion of gases in the body cavity' related to LAPS: lack of field experience and of scientific data has reduced the global certainty level of this hazard;
- Cervical dislocation does not always lead to the immediate onset of unconsciousness;
 - Cervical dislocation should not be used for routine stunning -> only be applied as back-up method;
 - Manual cervical dislocation should not be applied to ducks and geese, and to any bird heavier than 3 kg;
 - Cervical dislocation by crushing should not be used under any circumstances.



- **Bleeding during slaughter without stunning** will expose 100% of animals to hazards that apply to the bleeding phase
- The use of this method will lead to unavoidable pain, fear and distress
 - To prevent birds experiencing severe welfare consequences such as pain and fear animals should not be bled while conscious

- Bleeding following stunning

- Birds should be prevented from recovering consciousness;
- During the bleeding phase, unconsciousness should be monitored until birds are dead;

For both methods: to prevent pain and fear, death must be monitored and confirmed in birds before they enter the scalding tank.



Scientific opinion on the killing for purposes other than slaughter: poultry

Adopted in September 2019

Published in November 2019 at: <u>https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/5850</u>



Other purposes

- large scale killings in case of depopulation for disease control purposes and similar situations (environmental contamination, disaster management, etc.) <u>outside slaughterhouses</u>.
- killing of unproductive animals that might be practiced on-farm; this can occur for health, welfare or economic reasons and can be split in two subcategories:
 - large-scale killing of unproductive birds (e.g. maceration of dayold chicks);
 - 2. individual killing of unproductive, unhealthy or injured birds.

Stunning/killing methods included in the SO



- Electrical methods (+ restraint):
 - 1.Waterbath
 - 2.Head-only
 - 3.Head-to-body
- Modified atmosphere methods:
 - 1. Whole house gassing
 - 2. Whole house gassing with gas-filled foam
 - 3.Gas mixtures in containers
 - 4.Low atmospheric pressure stunning/killing (LAPS)
 - 5. Modified atmospheres for day-old chicks

Mechanical methods (+ restraint):

- 1.Captive bolt
- 2.Percussive blow to the head

Mechanical killing-only (non stunning) methods:

- 1.Cervical dislocation following stunning
- 2.Neck-cutting (bleeding) following stunning
- 3. Maceration of day-old chicks
- 4. Decapitation following stunning
- 5.Brain piercing following stunning
- Lethal injection (+ restraint)





Gas filled expansion foam, courtesy of Livetec systems UK











- 29 hazards and majority linked to failure in provoking death & lack of skills by staff
 - >Training of farm staff;
 - Roles and responsibilities of staff involved in large-scale killing on-farm should be clearly identified.
 - > Appropriate measures:
 - written SOPs, contingency plans;
 - training and rotation of the staff;
 - appropriate setting and use of the equipment.
- 8 welfare consequences identified:

Not dead (after application of the killing method)	Pain
Consciousness (after application of the killing method)	Fear
Heat stress	Distress
Cold stress	Respiratory distress

 The AHAW Panel agrees with the principles of the OIE Terrestrial code regarding unacceptable methods ... examples of methods that should not be used: killing poultry by burying, burning, drowning; the addition of poisons, pesticides or any other toxic substances to feed or water for killing



- Electrical methods
 - Head-only electrical stunning does not lead to death
 - If applied --> a killing procedure should follow (e.g. cervical dislocation)
 - For on-farm killing of poultry using a waterbath a minimum current of 400 mA and frequency of maximum 50 Hz should be used

- Modified atmosphere method
 - Since modified atmosphere methods do not induce immediate loss of consciousness, the welfare consequences can be experienced by the birds during the induction phase
 - Whole house stunning is the preferred method, when feasible to seal the barn, because does not require handling of birds;
 - In whole house gassing, direct injection of liquid gas in the barn should not be used.



- Mechanical methods
- Captive bolt is enough to kill the animal: death should be confirmed after shooting.
 - Repeated use of a captive bolt gun will lead to overheating of the barrel and failure of the gun. A sufficient number of guns should be made available such that each one can be rested to cool off.

Cervical dislocation:

- by crushing should not be used
- by stretching and twisting of the neck should only be applied to kill unconscious birds

Decapitation and brain piercing:

- should not be used for killing conscious birds
- Maceration of day-old chicks: 3 hazards identified and having staff as origin: i) slow rotation of blades or rollers ii) rollers set too wide iii) overloading'
 - Technology to prevent the necessity of killing surplus/unproductive animals (e.g. male day-old chicks from layers' genotypes) should be encouraged in single farmscale killing as well as big hatcheries



Lethal injection

- If not performed correctly, lethal injection can be very painful and birds remain conscious/alive experiencing severe welfare consequences, such as pain, fear and distress
 - should be administered strictly following the manufacturer's instructions on dose, route and rate of administration
 - poisons/toxins should not be used for killing for purposes other than slaughter.

For any killing method:

A back-up killing method should be ready at any time

□ Death should always be confirmed before disposing of carcasses

Thank you for your attention!



AHAW landing page:

https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/topics/topic/animal-health-and-welfare



Scientific advice on all aspects of animal diseases and well-being of food producing-animals during breeding, rearing, transportation and slaughter. Analysis of the impact that the conditions and treatment of animals can have on both animal and human health.

Follow us also on Twitter: @Animals_EFSA

e-mail to: ALPHA@efsa.europa.eu



Subscribe to

efsa.europa.eu/en/news/newsletters efsa.europa.eu/en/rss **Receive job alerts**

careers.efsa.europa.eu - job alerts



Follow us on Twitter

@efsa_eu
@plants_efsa
@methods_efsa
@animals_efsa

Follow us Linked in Linkedin.com/company/efsa



Email

ask@efsa.europa.eu

in