Draft ID: cfefb4fa-f873-4833-9a07-539dc6425189

Date: 20/05/2020 12:48:06

Evaluation of the EU Animal Welfare Strategy 2012-2015

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

The European Union has been promoting animal welfare for over 40 years gradually improving the lives of farm animals. The EU has among the world's highest standards of animal welfare. The overall framework for EU action on animal welfare is set out in the <u>EU Animal Welfare Strategy 2012-2015</u> ('the Strategy'). The main objectives of the Strategy were to:

- 1. consider simplifying the EU legislation on animal welfare;
- 2. support Member States to improve compliance with animal welfare legislation;
- 3. improve EU level knowledge of certain welfare issues, such as the welfare of farmed fish;
- promote EU animal welfare standards globally;
- 5. improve synergies with the Common Agriculture Policy (CAP) and other EU policies;
- 6. and better inform consumers and the general public about animal welfare.

To achieve these objectives, the Strategy had set 20 actions to be implemented between 2012 and 2015.

The European Commission will use information collected through this public consultation, together with other data, to evaluate the Animal Welfare Strategy.

If you are unable to use the online questionnaire, please contact us: SANTE-CONSULT-G2@ec.europa.eu

About you

- Language of my contribution
 - Bulgarian
 - Croatian
 - Czech
 - Danish
 - Dutch
 - English
 - Estonian
 - Finnish
 - French
 - Gaelic

German		
Greek		
Hungarian		
Italian		
Latvian		· ·
Lithuanian		
Maltese		
Polish		
Portuguese		
Romanian		
Slovak		
Slovan Slovenian		
	111111111111111111111111111111111111111	
Spanish		
Swedish		a.
. Lam alvina my contribution o		
*I am giving my contribution a		* a
Academic/research inst	itution	
Business association		
Company/business orga		
Consumer organisation		
EU citizen		
Environmental organisa	ition	
Non-EU citizen		
Non-governmental orga	anisation (NGO)	
Public authority	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	
Trade union		
Other		
o Guiei		
* First name		
, we make	X	
	*	
*Surname		
* Email (this won't be published	4/	
* Email (this won't be publishe	u)	
1		
*Scope		
International		
© Local		
National		
	*	
Regional		
*Organisation name		= -
Organisation name		

Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality

Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

255 character(s) maximum

Country of origin

Check if your organisation is on the <u>transparency register</u>. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation. Afghanistan Djibouti Libya Saint Martin Liechtenstein Saint Pierre and Miquelon Albania Dominican Lithuania Saint Vincent

Republic

- Grenadines

 Algeria

 Ecuador

 Luxembourg

 Samoa

 Macau

 San Marino
- AmericanEgyptMacauSan Marino
- Andorra
 El Salvador
 Madagascar
 São Tomé and
- Príncipe

 Angola Equatorial Malawi Saudi Arabia
 - Guinea

 Anguilla

 © Eritrea

 © Malaysia

 © Senegal
- Anguilla
 Eritrea
 Malaysia
 Senegal
 Maldives
 Serbia
- Antigua and
 Eswatini
 Mali
 Seychelles
- ArgentinaEthiopiaMaltaSierra Leone
- Armenia
 Falkland Islands
 Marshall
 Singapore Islands
- Aruba
 Faroe Islands
 Martinique
 Sint Maarten
- Australia
 Fiji
 Mauritania
 Slovakia
 Mauritius
 Slovenia
- Azerbaijan
 France
 Mayotte
 Solomon Islands
- □ Bahamas □ French Guiana □ Mexico □ Somalia □ Somalia

and the

	Bangladesh		French Southern and Antarctic Lands	0	Moldova	0	South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
0	Barbados	0	Gabon	(1)	Monaco	0	South Korea
0	Belarus	(6)	Georgia	0	Mongolia	0	South Sudan
0		0	Germany		Montenegro	0	Spain
0	Belgium Belize	0	Ghana	0	Montserrat	0	Sri Lanka
0		0		0		0	Sudan
	Benin	0	Gibraltar		Morocco	0	
0	Bermuda	(6)	Greece	0	Mozambique		Suriname
	Bhutan		Greenland	0	Myanmar /Burma	0	Svalbard and Jan Mayen
0	Bolivia	0	Grenada	0	Namibia	0	Sweden
0	Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba	0	Guadeloupe	0	Nauru	0	Switzerland
0	Bosnia and Herzegovina	0	Guam	0	Nepal	0	Syria
0	Botswana	0	Guatemala	0	Netherlands	0	Taiwan
0	Bouvet Island	0	Guernsey	0	New Caledonia	0	Tajikistan
0	Brazil	0	Guinea	0	New Zealand	0	Tanzania
0	British Indian	0	Guinea-Bissau	0	Nicaragua	0	Thailand
	Ocean Territory		Guillou Biodau		Modragaa		
0	British Virgin Islands	0	Guyana	0	Niger	0	The Gambia
0	Brunei	0	Haiti	0	Nigeria	0	Timor-Leste
0	Bulgaria	0	Heard Island and McDonald Islands	0	Niue	0	Togo
0	Burkina Faso	0		0	Norfolk Island	0	Tokelau
0	Burundi	0	Hong Kong	0	Northern Mariana Islands	0	Tonga
0	Cambodia	0	Hungary	0	North Korea	6	Trinidad and Tobago
0	Cameroon	0	Iceland	0	North Macedonia	0	Tunisia
0	Canada	0	India	0	Norway	0	Turkey
0	Cape Verde	0	Indonesia	0	Oman	0	Turkmenistan
0	Cayman Islands	0		0	Pakistan		Turks and Caicos Islands
0	Central African Republic	0	Iraq	0	Palau	0	Tuvalu
0	Chad	0	Ireland	0	Palestine	0	Uganda
0	Chile	0	Isle of Man	0	Panama		Ukraine
. 0	China	0	Israel		Papua New Guinea	0	United Arab Emirates
0	Christmas Island	0	Italy	0	Paraguay		United Kingdom

	Clipperton	Jamaica	Peru	United States
	Cocos (Keeling) Islands	Japan	Philippines	United StatesMinor OutlyingIslands
	Colombia	Jersey	Pitcairn Islands	Uruguay
	O Comoros	Jordan	Poland	US Virgin Islands
	Congo	Kazakhstan	Portugal	Uzbekistan
	Cook Islands	Kenya	Puerto Rico	Vanuatu
	Costa Rica	Kiribati	Qatar	Vatican City
	Côte d'Ivoire	Kosovo	Réunion	Venezuela
	Croatia	Kuwait	Romania	Vietnam
	Cuba	Kyrgyzstan	Russia	Wallis and Futuna
	Curação	Laos	Rwanda	Western Sahara
	Cyprus	Latvia	SaintBarthélemy	Yemen
1	Czechia	Lebanon	 Saint Helena Ascension and Tristan da Cunha 	Zambia
	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Lesotho	Saint Kitts and Nevis	Zimbabwe
	Denmark	Liberia	Saint Lucia	
			A STATE OF THE STA	

* Publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only your type of respondent, country of origin and contribution will be published. All other personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number) will not be published.

Public

Your personal details (name, organisation name and size, transparency register number, country of origin) will be published with your contribution.

I agree with the personal data protection provisions

Awareness

- * How familiar are you with the EU Animal welfare strategy?
 - Not at all familiar
 - Somewhat familiar
 - Moderately familiar
 - Very familiar

- Extremely familiarDon't know

Which actions planned in the Strategy are you familiar with?

	Not at all familiar	Somewhat familiar	Moderately familiar	Very familiar	Extremely familiar	Don't know
* Actions to improve compliance (e.g. grouping of sows, protection of laying hens, etc).	0	0	0	0	0	0
* Guidelines (e.g. on transport, slaughter or the protection of pigs)	0	0	(a)	0	0	0
* Reports to EU institutions (e.g. on the various stunning methods for poultry, the impact of animal welfare international activities on competitiveness, etc).		0	•	0	0	•
* Studies (e.g. on the welfare of farmed fish at the time of transport and at slaughter, on animal welfare education to the general public, etc).	0	0	©	0	0	0
* International cooperation on animal welfare (e.g. multilateral, bilateral and capacity building activities).	0	0	©	0	0	0
* Actions to improve the integration of animal welfare in the Common Agricultural Policy.	•	©	0	0	0	0
* Communication and education activities targeting consumers and the general public.	0	0	0	0	0	0

* Other types of actions or activities (e.g. the establishment of reference centers, training activities, a possible legislative	0	0	•	0	•	0
proposal for a simplified EU legislative framework for animal welfare)						

Please specify all the actions or activities that you are familiar with.

1000 character(s) maximum

EC-actions on ensuring implementation ban on barren layer cages and implementation group housing of pregnant sows by Member States

Animal transport Guides, brochure on AW officer, Commission Recommendation on avoiding tail docking of piglets

(EFSA) Reports on stunning of Poultry, Animal Welfare aspects of slaughter or killing of pregnant livestock animals, etc.

Commission's report on the impact of animal welfare international activities Input in the OIE standard setting process concerning AW

EU reference centre for AW concerning Pigs.

Relevance

To what extent are the issues targeted by the Strategy still relevant today (2020)?

	Not at all relevant	Somewhat relevant	Moderately relevant	Very relevant	Extremely relevant	Don't know
* Non-compliance due to a lack of awareness among animal owners and handlers	. 0	0	0	0	0	0
* Non-compliance due to a lack of enforcement by national competent authorities	0	0	0	0	0	0
* Non-compliance due to weak incentives for businesses to comply	0	0	0	0	0	0
* A lack of information among consumers	0	0	0	0	0	0
* A need to simplify the legal framework	0	0	0	0	0	0
* A lack of knowledge on the welfare of farmed fish	0	0	0	0	0	0
* Insufficient use of synergies with the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)	0		0	0.	0	0
* An uneven level of protection for different animal species in the EU	0	0	0	0	0	0
* An uneven level playing field (EU and global market) for EU business operators	0	0	0	0	0	0

There (for which species, i	in which sectors and/or countries) is there a lack of
ompliance with EU anima	l welfare legislation?
Pigs (Council Directiv	e 2008/120/EC)
Laying Hens (Council	Directive 1999/74/EC)
Broilers (Council Dire	NOTATION AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AND AN
	ouncil Directive 98/58/EC)
	egulation (EC) N° 1099/2009)
☑ Transport (Council Regular)	
Other	39did:1011 EO 172000)
Do not know	
DO HOLKHOW	
lease specify the sectors	and countries for each option selected.
1000 character(s) maximum	and countries for each option selected.
1000 Character(s) maximum	
re there other current ani	mal welfare issues which are not reflected in the
	mal welfare issues which are not reflected in the
trategy?	mal welfare issues which are not reflected in the
trategy? © Yes	mal welfare issues which are not reflected in the
trategy? Yes No	mal welfare issues which are not reflected in the
trategy? © Yes	mal welfare issues which are not reflected in the
trategy? Yes No Do not know	
trategy? Yes No Do not know lease indicate which welf	mal welfare issues which are not reflected in the are issues are not reflected in the Strategy.
trategy? Yes No Do not know	
trategy? Yes No Do not know lease indicate which welf	are issues are not reflected in the Strategy.
trategy? Yes No Do not know Please indicate which welfa 400 character(s) maximum Problems with long transports o	are issues are not reflected in the Strategy.
Problems with long transports of Lacking of specific legislative El	are issues are not reflected in the Strategy.
Problems with long transports of Lacking of specific legislative Electrical Academic Problems	are issues are not reflected in the Strategy. f animals U welfare standards for more - commercially kept and traded - animal species
Problems at the stage of ca	are issues are not reflected in the Strategy. f animals U welfare standards for more - commercially kept and traded - animal species tching poultry for transport for slaughter
Problems at the stage of ca	are issues are not reflected in the Strategy. f animals U welfare standards for more - commercially kept and traded - animal species tching poultry for transport for slaughter posing EU-wide professional bans concerning working with animals /livestock

- * How coherent with each other were the Strategy's actions?
 - Not at all coherent
 - Somewhat coherent
 - Moderately coherent
 - Very coherent
 - Extremely coherent
 - Don't know
- * Are you aware of other national, EU or international interventions in the field of animal welfare that took place at the same time as the Strategy?
 - Yes
 - No

Please specify which interventions you are familiar with.

600 character(s) maximum

Establishment of EU Platform on Animal Welfare

Further development of OIE standards for AW

In NL the EU guides to good practices for transport of cattle and pigs will be leading for industry and competent authorities

In NL regulation on stunning of Eel before slaughter was introduced

In NL research was carried out and parameters were established on stunning of several fish species & research on water quality parameters for recirculation systems

To what extent do you agree with the following statements on the coherence of the Strategy with other interventions?

The Strategy was coherent with...

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
* the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)	0.	0	0	0	0	0
* animal health EU policies and interventions	0	0	0	0	0	0
* other EU-level policies and interventions related to animal welfare (e.g. environment, trade, single market, fisheries, and research)	•	0	0	0	0	0
* national policies and interventions related to animal welfare (e.g. environment, trade, single market, fisheries, and research)	0	0	0	0	0	
* non-EU interventions related to animal welfare (e.g. interventions by a third country, or by an international organisation such as the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO))	•	•	•	©	•	•

Could you specify areas of tension between the Strategy and other interventions with an incidence on animal welfare (EU, Member States, international organisations)?

Free Trade Agreements, when liberalizing market access for developed countries and emerging economies to the EU via preferential tariff rate quota or tariff rate reductions/eliminations for animal products like eggs & egg products and (pig) meat - for which the EU knows specific AW legislation - lead to a more uneven playing field on the EU market if the FTA partner has lower AW standards than the EU; Facilitating export of live animals for slaughter to third countries with weak animal welfare standards, especially concerning transport and slaughter, impairs animal welfare unnecessarily

Effectiveness

To what extent did the EU Strategy contribute to:

	No contribution	Some contribution	Moderate contribution	Fairly significant contribution	Great contribution	Don't know
* a better protection of animals across species in the EU?	0	0	0	0	0	0
* improving compliance by supporting Member State enforcement?	0	0	0	0	0	0
improving compliance by increasing awareness among animal owners and handlers?	0	0	0	0	•	0
* improving compliance by strengthening/developing incentives for businesses to comply?	0	0	0	•	0	0
* improving consumer information?	0	0	0	0	0	0
* improving knowledge and evidence on the welfare of farmed fish?	0	•	0	•	0	0
* promoting EU animal welfare standards at global level?	0	0	0	0	. 0	0
* improving the use of synergies with the Common Agricultural Policy (CAP)?	0	•	0	• •	0	0
creating a more level playing field (EU and global market) for EU businesses?	0	0	0	0	•	0

To what extent did the following factors influence the implementation of the EU Animal Welfare Strategy?

	Have hindered the implementation to a great extent	Have hindered the implementation to some extent	Have not influenced the implementation	Have facilitated the implementation to some extent	Have facilitated the implementation to a great extent	Don't know
Political factors (e.g. changing political priorities)	0	0	0	•	0	0
* Economic factors (e.g. market trends)	•	©	0	0	0	0
* Social factors (e.g. cultural changes, changes in consumer /citizens' expectations)	0	0	0		•	0
Scientific or technological factors (e.g. advances in animal welfare science)	•	0	0		•	0

Which actions/activities of the Strategy were the most effective in achieving their objectives?

- Actions to improve compliance (e.g. grouping of sows, protection of laying hens, etc).
- Guidelines (e.g. on transport, slaughter or the protection of pigs)
- Reports to EU institutions (e.g. on the various stunning methods for poultry, the impact of animal welfare international activities on competitiveness, etc).
- Studies (e.g. on the welfare of farmed fish at the time of transport and at slaughter, on animal welfare education to the general public, etc).
- International cooperation on animal welfare (e.g. multilateral, bilateral and capacity building activities).
- Actions to improve the integration of animal welfare in the Common Agricultural Policy.
- Communication and education activities targeting consumers and the general public.
- Other types of actions or activities (e.g. the establishment of reference centers, training activities, a possible legislative proposal for a simplified EU legislative framework for animal welfare).

Please specify the actions/activities that you feel were most effective.

600 character(s) maximum

EC-actions on ensuring implementation ban on barren layer cages and implementation group housing of pregnant sows by Member States

- * Which actions/activities of the Strategy were the least effective in achieving their objectives?
 - Actions to improve compliance (e.g. grouping of sows, protection of laying hens, etc).
 - Guidelines (e.g. on transport, slaughter or the protection of pigs)
 - Reports to EU institutions (e.g. on the various stunning methods for poultry, the impact of animal welfare international activities on competitiveness, etc).
 - Studies (e.g. on the welfare of farmed fish at the time of transport and at slaughter, on animal welfare education to the general public, etc).
 - International cooperation on animal welfare (e.g. multilateral, bilateral and capacity building activities).
 - Actions to improve the integration of animal welfare in the Common Agricultural Policy.
 - Communication and education activities targeting consumers and the general public.
 - Other types of actions or activities (e.g. the establishment of reference centers, training activities, a possible legislative proposal for a simplified EU legislative framework for animal welfare).

Efficiency

* How familiar are you with the funding and human resources associated with the Strategy?

- Not at all familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Moderately familiar
- Very familiar
- Extremely familiar
- Don't know

To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the funding and human resources provided for the implementation of the EU Animal Welfare Strategy?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
* The activities outlined in the Strategy received sufficient funding	0	0	0	0	0	0
* The human resources provided for the implementation of the Strategy were sufficient	•	0	0	0	0	0
* Considering the costs of the actions and the results achieved, the benefits outweigh the costs	0	. ©	•	0	0	

- *To what extent were the funding and human resources associated with the Animal Welfare Strategy appropriate both given the challenges the Strategy faced and its achievements?
 - Not at all appropriate
 - Somewhat appropriate
 - Moderately appropriate
 - Very appropriate
 - Extremely appropriate
 - Don't know

To what extent do you agree with the following statements about the added value of the Strategy?

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Don't know
--	----------------------	----------	-------------------------------------	-------	-------------------	---------------

* The Strategy brought benefits in the field of animal welfare, or related fields, that could not have been achieved through national interventions alone.	•	0		0	0	0
* The Strategy had a negative impact on existing national interventions in the field of animal welfare, or related fields.	. 0	0	0	0	0	0
Animal welfare issues across the EU called for EU action.	0	0	0	٥	0	0
* The Strategy brought benefits that the EU could not have achieved without it.	0	0	•	0	0	0

*To what extent did the Strategy simplify and develop clear principles for animal welfare by other means than new legislation?

- Not at all
- To some extent
- To a moderate extent
- To a significant extent
- To a great extent
- Don't know

EU Added Value

Are there any other views on the Strategy that you would like to share? Please note that you may upload a document/position paper as part of your response to this consultation.

600 character(s) maximum

Important:

Improve and supplement current legislative provisions on animal welfare, also enabling adequate application and harmonised enforcement of EU regulations (e.g. on transport and on pig welfare);

Introduce specific legislative EU welfare standards for more, commercially kept and traded animal species; Introduce EU legislation for imposing EU-wide professional bans concerning working with animals /livestock farming and an EU-wide blacklist of the persons involved;

Promote animal welfare standards and a level playing field in non-EU countries (at the level of the EU minimum standards)

Please upload your file

The maximum file size is 1 MB
Only files of the type pdf,txt,doc,docx,odt,rtf are allowed

Contact

SANTE-CONSULT-G2@ec.europa.eu