



QUALITY TRANSPORT AND CONTROL POST

Work Package 5
Deliverable 5.6

Report containing results of the international conference

Authors:

Kees de Roest, Andrea Porcelluzzi

CRPA

June 30th 2014

Call for proposals SANCO 10834/2011
Grant Agreement no. SANCO/2011/G3/CRPA/SI2.610274

Colophon

This report is an official deliverable of the Quality Control Post project.

The project “Development of EU wide animal transport certification system and renovation of control posts in the European Union” foresees a significant improvement of the equipment as well as the management of Control Posts (CPs) located at the cross roads of important flows of animals transported over long journeys in the EU; the development of a qualitycertification systems for the transporters of animals operating on very long journeys.

The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Community's Call for proposals SANCO 10834/2011 under Grant Agreement no SANCO/2011/G5/CRPA/SI2.610274

Project Office Quality Control Post
Centro Ricerche Produzioni Animali Spa
Viale Timavo 43/2
IT-42121 Reggio Emilia
Italy
Phone +39 0522 436999
Fax +39 0522 435142
e-mail controlpost@crpa.it

The text of this report represents the authors' views and does not necessarily represent a position of the European Commission who will not be liable for the use made of such information.



List of co-authors

IT: Centro Ricerche Produzioni Animali (CRPA)

The text of this report represents the authors' views and does not necessarily represent a position of the European Commission who will not be liable for the use made of such information.

Contents

AGENDA OF THE FINAL CONFERENCE OF THE ANIMAL TRANSPORT CERTIFICATION AND CONTROL POST PROJECT	5
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS	6
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE.....	9

AGENDA OF THE FINAL CONFERENCE OF THE ANIMAL TRANSPORT CERTIFICATION AND CONTROL POST PROJECT

Improvement of Animal Welfare During Long Distance transport

Meeting place: Steigenberger Kurhaus Hotel, Scheveningen The Hague
Wednesday 7th of May 2014

9.00 Registration of the participants

9.30 Start of Conference

9.30 Welcome and overview of project results

Kees de Roest *Centro Ricerche Produzioni Animali - CRPA*

Jennifer Woods *Animal Transport Association - ATA*

9.50 Animal transport conditions in the EU: the potential role of a certification system

Denis Simonin *EU Commission - DG SANCO*

10.00 Renovation and new buildings of control posts in France, Poland, Hungary and Greece

Paolo Ferrari *Centro Ricerche Produzioni Animali - CRPA*

10.15 Results of 200 assessments of long distance transports of cattle, pigs, horses and sheep in the EU

Hans Spoolder *Wageningen UR Livestock Research – WUR DLO*

11.00 Coffee and tea break

11.15 Long distance transport of cattle and pigs in Canada and the USA (legislation and transport conditions)

Jennifer Woods *Animal Transport Association - ATA*

Kelly Wheeler *Aviagen*

12.00 A pilot certification scheme for animal transport in the EU

Kristina Nielsen *A/S Baltic Control Ltd*

12.30 A new handbook and guidelines for high quality transport in the EU

Silvia D'Albenzio *IZS - Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale Dell'Abruzzo e del Molise*

13.00 Lunch

14.00 Results of stakeholders consultation

14.00 Harmonisation of the authorisation of control posts in the EU

Paolo Ferrari *Centro Ricerche Produzioni Animali - CRPA*

14.45 Long distance transport of cattle and pigs in the EU and the USA (legislation and transport conditions)

Jennifer Woods *Animal Transport Association - ATA*

Stefano Messori *IZS - Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale Dell'Abruzzo e del Molise*

15.30 Coffee and tea break

15.45 Animal welfare during long distance transport: role of animal based parameters

Hans Spoolder *Wageningen UR Livestock Research – WUR DLO*

16.30 Costs and benefits of a private versus public control system

Elsje Oosterkamp *Agricultural Economics Research Institute - LEI*

Kristina Nielsen *A/S Baltic Control Ltd*

17.15 Closure of the Conference

Kees de Roest *Centro Ricerche Produzioni Animali - CRPA*

Kelly Wheeler *Animal Transport Association - ATA*

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

#	Last Name	First Name	Country	Organization
1	Antognarelli	Roberto	Italy	COMOS
2	Barbier	Virginie	France	Ministère de l'Agriculture (France) Bureau de la Protection Animale
3	Bardy	Romain	France	Bardy Bresse
4	Baumann	Per	Sweden	Eurocommerce
5	Boelrijk	Henk	The Netherlands	Dutch Federation of Agriculture (LTO Nederland)
6	Bulmer	Anna	UK	PIC UK
7	Caponi	Carlotta	Italy	ASSO.TRA.BE. / FAI UMBRIA
8	D'Albenzio	Silvia	Italy	IZS
9	De Leeuw	Joop	The Netherlands	NVWA
10	de Roest	Kees	Italy	CRPA
11	Drique	Robert	France	Qualivia
12	Drique	Valérie	France	Qualivia
13	Dyson	Alan	UK	PIC Europe
14	Ferrari	Paolo	Italy	CRPA
15	Geart	Benedictus	The Netherlands	Veepro
16	Gebresenbet	Girma	Sweden	Swedish University of Aricultural Sciences
17	Gębska	Monika	Poland	SGGW
18	Godfroid	Anthony	Belgium	Essenzia Advocaten
19	Gostelie	Erik	The Netherlands	VEEPRO HOLLAND
20	Govers	Dirk	The Netherlands	VAEX
21	Harper	Eddie	UK	EH Consultancy
22	Hernández	Gabriela	Spain	IRTA
23	Hoedemaker	Laurens	The Netherlands	EuroFAWC, the European Forum for Animal Welfare Councils
24	Hüber	Zoltán	Hungary	Ministry of Rural Development (Hungary)
25	Iovis	Nikolaos	Greece	Rural Economy and Veterinary Directorate of Regional Unit of Drama, Greece
26	Jacobs	Leonie	Belgium	Institute for Agricultural and Fisheries Research (ILVO)
27	Kernaleguen	Louis	France	SAS ADN
28	Kettlewell	Peter	UK	Peter Kettlewell

29	Kible	Anna	France	STH IPAVIA
30	Koper	Jonna	The Netherlands	ILVO/WUR
31	Krumpel	Markus	Germany	BDT
32	Lesuis	René	The Netherlands	Netherlands Food and Consumer Products Safety Authority
33	Maguire	Desmond	Ireland	European Commission Food and Veterinary Office, DG SANCO
34	Marahrens	Michael	Germany	FLI
35	Mesman	Sanna	The Netherlands	Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA)
36	Messori	Stefano	Italy	Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale dell'Abruzzo e del Molise "G. Caporale"
37	Mortimer	Sarah	United kingdom	CROWE LIVESTOCK
38	Musella	Claudio Tommaso	Italy	FRATELLI SICILIANI SRL . italy
39	Oosterkamp	Elsje	The Netherlands	WUR
40	Ouweltjes	Wijbrand Ouweltjes	The Netherlands	Wageningen UR Livestock Research
41	Papadopoulos	Vasileios	Greece	Louky1 Control Post
42	Pastare	Tatjana	Latvia	Food and Veterinary Service of Latvia
43	Patrick	Chevillon	France	IFIP Institut du Porc
44	Pedernera	Cecilia	Spain	IRTA
45	Porcelluzzi	Andrea	Italy	CRPA
46	Quinteros	Katherine	EU	European Commission
47	Sauvain	Lucie	France	BARDY BRESSE
48	Schaap	Nammen	The Netherlands	B.V. V/h Firma Schaap
49	Schons	Hans Peter	Germany	German Animal Breeders' Federation (ADT)
50	Serrien	Kenneth	Canada	OHS
51	Siciliani	Francesco	Italy	FRATELLI SICILIANI SRL . italy
52	Simonin	Denis	EU	European Commission
53	Sleegers	Willie	The Netherlands	W. Sleegers Veetransport B.V.
54	Sloth Nielsen	Kristina	Denmark	A/S Baltic Control Ltd
55	Sommen van den	Eric	The Netherlands	Ministry of Economic Affairs
56	Sossidou	Evangelia	Greece	HELLENIC AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION - DEMETER
57	Spoolder	Hans	The Netherlands	Wageningen UR Livestock Research

58	Steendijk	Margreet	The Netherlands	Eyes on Animals
59	Stokes	Ashley	USA	UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII
60	Stuardo	Leopoldo	UE	World Organisation for Animal Health
61	Thenissen	Laura	The Netherlands	COPEX
62	Thijsse	Piet	The Netherlands	nbhv
63	Tilburg	Raimond	The Netherlands	AFKL Cargo
64	van de Braak	Kees	The Netherlands	KBAgro
65	van den Berg	Bert	The Netherlands	Dutch Society for the Protection of Animals
66	Vande Cappelle	Filip	Belgium	EHS
67	Visser	Kathalijne	The Netherlands	Wageningen UR Livestock Research
68	Voas	Andrew	UK	Scottish Government
69	Vousdouka	Venetia	Greece	Nagref Demetra
70	Westen	Hannah	UK	World Horse Welfare
71	Wheeler	Kelly	USA	AVIAGEN
72	White	Jo	UK	Progressive Ideas
73	Woods	Jennifer	Canada	J. Woods Livestock Services/ATA
74	Xexaki	Anna	Greece	HELLENIC AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION - DEMETER

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE



The conference starts at 9.30

De Roest welcomes the attending people, presents the agenda of the conference and introduces the speakers.

Paolo Ferrari presents the results of “Renovation and new building of control posts in the EU” (WP1).

Denis Simonin presents ms Quinteros, new project officer who will follow the implementation of project, and then he illustrates the background of the project.

SIMONIN: even if now the Commission is in a transition phase due to the imminent European election, it is possible to affirm that animal transport issue is coming back on the agenda. Most NGOs are in favour for limiting the animal transport to 8 hours. What is interesting in this project is that it focuses on transport over long distances: even if it is only a small percentage of animal transport. It increases a knowledge that can be capitalized in the whole issue of animal transport.

Moreover, the focus on the certification scheme is important, because it could provide an added value, increasing the credibility of the implementation of better welfare in the animal transport, representing a valid integration of the official checks.

Finally, I announce that within few weeks DG SANCO will publish a call for tender about guidelines for animal transport, which foresees also a strong involvement of the stakeholders.

Hans Spoolder presents the results of “Scientific basis for a certification scheme of animal transport” (WP2).

Discussion

STEENDIJK: Why poultry is not included in this study?

SIMONIN: Because the mandate of the parliament was on the renovation of CPs and on a certification scheme for cattle, pigs, sheep and horses.

STEENDIJK: Why dehydration is not taken into account?

SPOOLDER: Because the level of thirst is difficult to assess with animal based parameters, but we can assess it indirectly through a risk assessment. The assessment is however resource based (number of drinkers and facility of access to drinkers).

SICILIANI: We should involve more the drivers in the animal welfare management, but also we should reconsider the rules about sea transportation: for instance in our experience we have seen that the hours allowed by the present regulation are not sufficient to guarantee animal welfare for the animals to be transported by vessel.

HOEDEMAKER; Are we still talking about an increase of animal welfare (as for the Welfare Plus scheme) or we are just trying to reduce the negative effect of the transport on welfare? Should these assessments be done only by researchers and scientists or by society as a whole?

SPOOLDER: As the first question is concerned, in any case transportation of animals will cause some level of stress, so the focus is on minimizing the risks. As to the second question: the questionnaire was sent to all the categories of stakeholders related to animal transports, but not to consumers, because we needed the opinion of people that have knowledge about animals.

THIJSSE: Animal based measure are new indicators that should not replace the existing ones, but they would be added to it. This could bring us to new rules, while we as industry would like to decrease them.

SPOOLDER: As a matter of fact as a scientist I think that some of the existing resource based measures should be replaced by animal based parameters, but this is a matter of policy making.

SCHONS: Who could do the assessments? It seems to me that they require a high level of knowledge, and this aspect could lead to high costs.

SPOOLDER. You will need some level of training. We have spent 2-3 days of work to accomplish the training.

IOVIS: During my participation to the questionnaire of Delphi, I have had the impression that there was a higher tolerance for the animals destined to slaughterhouses.

SPOOLDER: What we did, according to the Delphi methodology, was to cut off the opinions that were significantly distant from the average: it could be happened that such a position was expressed in some comments, but only by few.

Presentation of the topic “Long distance transport of cattle and pigs in Canada and the USA” by Kelly Wheeler and Jennifer Woods

Discussion

WESTEN: Is it illegal to not use dividers for horses?

WHEELER: No, it is not.

GEBRESENBET: In your presentation we saw very low figures about the dead animals on arrival in slaughterhouses: how have they been measured?

WOODS: By inspection: animal arrived dead have to be reported, these are data from the Government.

Presentation of the topic “A pilot certification scheme for animal transport in the EU” by Kristina Nielsen

Discussion

MESMAN: What will be the incentive for participating in this scheme?

NIELSEN: There should be a demand from outside, from other actors of the chain.

DE ROEST: By means of the involvement of the stakeholders representatives we are discussing about the possibility that this certification scheme could be attractive for the final users, slaughterhouses or retailers for example. The market of this sector is

very competitive, and the adopting of such a scheme could be a way to distinguish themselves from other competitors.

The first part of the conference ends at 13.00

At 14.00 begins the second part of the conference

Presentation of the topic “A new handbook and guidelines for high quality transport in the EU” by Silvia D’Albenzio

Presentation of the topic “Costs and benefits of a private versus public control system” by Elsje Oosterkamp

Discussion starting points:

What need to be done to attract the interest of transporters in a scheme focusing on animal welfare?

How can cost and benefits along the chain be shared? What incentives need to be introduced?

What needs to be done to make the schemes a licence to deliver?

How could a reduction of the public inspection time be realised?

SCHONS: The investment costs you consider is only 2 Million €. This is a very low figure. Have you taken into account the benefits?

OOSTERKAMP: These are yearly costs, we use the data from the first control posts project. We did not take into account the yearly benefits, this is true.

SCHONS: About license to deliver: I do not understand the approach, because if you have a Welfare Plus scheme, this should be above the requirements.

OOSTERKAMP: The license to deliver is mandatory anyhow by law.

SCHONS: About inspections: I do not see the link between the possible benefits deriving from the reduction of public inspections and this certification scheme, as this scheme is private.

OOSTERKAMP: If there is a good information flow and the scheme is well secured and well communicated, it could be offered as a guarantee to the Competent authority, which may allow for a reduction of public inspections. In the Netherlands we have had a similar situation, even if now this experience has finished.

MARAHRENS: A certification scheme lowers the risks in any case. About the cost. For example, for mouth-disease you have calculated 11 Millions, in my opinion this is very low: for instance we should consider the costs for society. In reality costs are much higher. Moreover I do not understand the relation with the certification scheme.

OOSTERKAMP: In the certification scheme there are some indicators related to bio-security measures, and the figures shown are only related to the animal welfare aspects.

BAUMANN: To my opinion I think it is excellent to have this kind of costs analysis done, because it is the only way to attract the operators toward this certification scheme. In Eurocommerce we are talking about the opportunity to use a risk based approach, and of course if an operator, using a private certification scheme, could lower the risks, he should have some benefits from the competent authorities. There are some Member States where the public inspections are paid by taxes, so it would be very critical to spread out the gains of this kind of costs for the operators involved.

LESUIS: I think we should consider also the costs and benefits related to the better transport condition.

OOSTERKAMP: This is true, but even without this costs we can see there are benefits. Now we should interrogate about what could be done to attract the operators for this scheme.

SCHONS: We cannot say, for instance, that due to this certification scheme we have less injured animals, because this should be the effect of the actual regulation, not a benefit due to the fact that we are beyond it. I do not understand the concept, I do not see any benefit from me, because the scheme is very close to the regulation.

OOSTERKAMP: In our assessments we have seen differences in the number of injuries, comparing to the condition before, so even with this small increase we have seen some benefits due to the scheme

IOVIS: How do you calculate the public inspection costs? I suppose you have some data from The Netherlands or from other countries.

OOSTERKAMP: We just calculated which kind of difference it would make between the situation as it is now and the hypothetical situation in the future. We did not calculate the specific costs of an inspection.

BAUMANN You cannot export the Dutch system also because the modality of the inspections and their impact varies in each member state: for instance in the Netherlands the inspection are paid by Industries, in other countries they are paid by taxpayers.

OOSTERKAMP: According to the results of the transport assessments we assessed an increase in AW due to this measure, and so we assumed a moderate benefit

Spolder presents the first results of the online consultation “Animal welfare during long distance transport: role of animal based parameters”

SPOOLDER: Is a combination of ABM and RBM required for a certification scheme?

MARAHRENS: The RBMs are good to calculate: what we have to do to guarantee a certain level of animal welfare during transport. The ABMs are useful to evaluate the quality of transport, to look what you will find at the end of the transport.

SOSSIDOU: I agree with Marahrens' comment, but how many assessments you need to do per transporter to say that there has been an improvement in the AW?

THIJSSE: From the industry side the risk with ABMs is that they will add new rules over the other existing parameters and rules: there should be also advantages for them. Industries want to improve animal welfare during transport and do a lot of investments on this issue, but adding rules to rules and costs to costs it is not a way.

SPOOLDER: This leads us to another question I have posed in the discussion groups: could ABMs be useful for the operators to self-assess their management, and are they sufficient to replace other measurements we have now?

OUWELTJES: what we aim to is not to add rules but to assess ABM as a tool for transporters to improve their works.

MARAHRENS: We should distinguish if the elements that rise the costs are always related to animal welfare. For instance, in the pig sector the next generation of trucks will be more expensive because of the implementation of the full-closed truck, and

this is not a requirement related to animal welfare even if transporters say so, because you can use conventional trucks. So we must clearly relate the hypothetical higher costs to the rules.

BAUMANN Conventional trucks can be used to transport animals across Europe and beyond but only in certain periods of the year, and also we have pressures from society to have closed trucks.

SAUVAIN: I also think that the use of closed trucks does not increase significantly the level of animal welfare, even if you would need to use this solution, of course, in some weather conditions. And then, the investment in closed trucks is very high.

SPOOLDER: Let's try to imagine an extreme situation: what if we throw over board all the resource based measures and the transporters will be assessed and rewarded only on the basis of how animals look like at the end of transport?

KRUMPEL It is very important for the transporters also to check the animals at the farm, to see if they have been prepared properly for transport. The crucial point is that transporters have to check the needs of the animals. This is not a technical solution that could be suitable for all the conditions. It is difficult to standardize the transports because each trip is different, and it is first of all the experience of the transporter that makes the difference.

CAPPONI I agree with Krumpel, we need to check the status of the animals but we should also involve our costumers, such as the slaughterhouses. Animal welfare must be a concern not only of the transporters, because we adapt our transport services on the basis of our costumers' request; moreover, the monitoring by the Competent Authorities should not be focused only on transport but on the whole chain.

SPOOLDER: But do you feel more comfortable, let's say, if in a hypothetical scenario the checks would be made on the basis only of the status of the animals?

SCHONS: I would say that I'll prefer this hypothetical situation, but you have already told us that with animal based measures you cannot check everything, so it's not practicable. Now we are in a situation where the monitoring is only on resource based measures, and we are not happy. So we are looking for a system that is more

efficient and/or more cost-effective. This should be the objective, and one way to achieve it is to check if some RBMs could be replaced by ABMs.

Ouweltjes I would say that ABM are essentials, but we need to keep the RBM, because they allow to prevent the insurgence of negative situation, and not to react after.

Marahrens I agree that ABM are retrospective measures, while the RBM are preventives one. So we should use RBM to assess the system to be used, and the ABM to check if the system is working.

Schons but if you ... who is going to pay for it?

Hoedemaker We can try to find a smarter combination. ABM are more expensive and time consuming, so one possibility could be to use the RBM measures more frequently to check the compliance with the minimum system requirements, while ABM could be used, I guess, one each 2-3 years, to assess the weakness points of a transport company, then asking in case an action plan to improve these points.

Marahrens: I also think that we should integrate ABM with RBM. But I think also that there should be some flexibility with RBM, if ABM show positive outcomes. And such a combination could be suitable for a certification system.

Messori presents the first results of the online consultation “Long distance transport of cattle and pigs in the EU and the USA (legislation and transport conditions)”

The discussion starts with the following questions:

Which aspects of transport have to be covered by an AW regulation?

Is there need of having regulations or other control means are to preferred?

Are the legislation currently in place sufficient to protect animal welfare?

Legislation wording: better to have fully detailed provision (e.g. numbers) or more ‘adaptable’ wording?

How relevant are non-regulatory approaches in protecting animal welfare during transport?

IOVIS: EU regulations are very detailed regarding AW conditions and requirements for the operators, but this is not for the manufacturers of trucks. Why, for instance, the EU did not impose the same standards requested for AW to the truck producers?

MESSORI: I think that not always is easy to provide detailed provisions, also because situations are different and manufacturers have to create something that could be adaptable.

WOODS: In U.S. we try to not be too prescriptive, because there is more than one way to do something right. And being too prescriptive can create an obstacle for innovation and the development of more efficient solution.

GEBRESENBET: Even if the driving time allowed in the U.S. is so much higher with respect to the European regulation, you showed us very low figures related to dead animals on arrivals. This is not in line with the scientific findings. Is the scientific society influenced by politicians?

WOODS: U.S. is made of fifty states, very difficult to find an agreement suitable for all. In Canada instead we develop regulations with the collaboration of all the stakeholders.

MARAHRENS: USA and Canada legislations are goal directed, but if you do not have a checking system this kind of approach is not very effective. Coming back to the previous question: why EU regulation are so specific in some details? I think that this is because our legislation is based on RBMs, in order to secure animal welfare. If we change to a goal directed legislation, we should also implement a monitoring system at the arrivals of the animals.

WOODS: But we do carry out analyses. We do count, and we do audit at animals at arrival. If you are saying that we do not check, this is not true. We do check. But even if we do not have the same level of regulations, we are able to do our transports efficiently.

GEBRESENBET: What surprises me is that this morning you show us very good data about animal welfare of the animals while regulations almost does not exist. That is not possible.

STOKES: We do not have a lot of federal regulations, but there are some at state level and our industry is very powerful.

WOODS: (to Gebresenbet) are you saying that our data are not correct? The numbers are collected at slaughterhouses by official inspectors.

MESSORI: We should consider also that we are talking about data concerning animals dead at arrival. Even if the animals travel uncomfortably, they do not die.

HOEDEMAKER A low number of dead animals on arrival is not enough to say that the animal welfare level is high.

WOODS: But the starting question it was which regulations we have, I'm not saying that we have a better level of AW. There are studies about it but this was not the topic.

STOKES If you are not prescriptive you need some kind of guidelines, because if not the interpretation could vary a lot, and therefore the implementation could become not very effective.

Ferrari presents the first results of the online consultation “Harmonisation of the authorisation of control posts in the EU”

Discussion starting points:

1) EU Guidelines to authorise CP authorization are welcome for more effective enforcement of the EU regulations

2) Expert groups of the national CAs should be established in all MSs and linked together to share opinions and adopt common effective measures to enforce regulations across EU

3) Biosecurity measures should be better based on risk analysis than on equal fixed standards in every CP

MAGUIRE we already have regular meetings of the national contact points of AW in transport.

IOVIS It is not so easy to harmonize CPs regulations, because there are many differences between member states conditions.

FERRARI: In my opinion in this project the guidelines produced could be a good starting point, even if they are for the CPs willing to be certificated for a Welfare+ scheme.

IOVIS: We should keep in mind that CPs are an important element for animal welfare, but they are also a business. So it is good for business if the rules are the same in all Europe. I would welcome an harmonization. Regarding the third statement, we have to differentiate according to the specific conditions of each country.

SICILIANI: What about measures related to the animals that are not in transit?

FERRARI: In the regulation you do not find anything about it. In the feasibility study some minimum distances have been set for the new CPs. But doing so you should take into consideration also the species. Of course the best situation is to have no animal farms in the area, but there are not specific measures in the regulation.

MARAHRENS: The highest risk to use CPs is related to biosecurity. In the context of an harmonization a procedure to assess a risk analysis for CPs should be discussed.

De Roest thanks everybody for the fruitful meeting and closes the conference at 18.00