

Written questions to Mr Giuliano Marchesin
Director of OI INTERCARNEITALIA
Public Hearing on “*Recommendations for the future*”

	QUESTIONS FROM EPP
QUESTIONS	No written questions
ANSWERS	

QUESTIONS FROM S & D	
<p>QUESTIONS from</p> <p>MEP Maria NOICHL</p>	<p>There are frequent reports of end of use dairy cows that are transported despite not being fit for transport. Calves and cows are frequently reported to have their tails twisted to make them move forward or are beaten with sticks. End of use dairy cows who no longer able to stand up are dragged on transporters.</p> <p>What - if any - special training do transporters or farmers undertake to prevent animals being transported when they are in a poor state? Also what special training do they receive to stop animals getting into a poor state in the first place?</p>
<p>ANSWERS</p>	<p>EN</p>
	<p>They refer to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - EU regulation 2016/628 of the commission, Annex V - - official certificate of emergency slaughter outside the slaughterhouse pursuant to Article 4 of the Commission Delegated Regulation EU 2019/624 <p>In a nutshell, the law provides that when the farmer has doubts that a bovine is unable to withstand the journey to the slaughterhouse, he must consult his company veterinarian to check the conditions of the animal and if so, obtain a transportability certificate. If, on the other hand, the bovine cannot be transported, it is expected to be slaughtered on the farm which must be attended by the official veterinarian who authorizes the slaughter by attending all stages. When required, the public veterinarian can order the killing and subsequent destruction of the garment.</p> <p>Transporters have a specific license for animal transport and if they carry out slaughtering on the farm they must have an additional specific license. Co-responsibility is envisaged between breeder, company veterinarian, official veterinarian and transporter to ensure that the law is respected as much as possible</p> <p>Those who mistreat animals are punished by the laws already provided and the breeders are the first guardians of animal welfare. No one has an interest in mistreating animals and, if someone does, they must be punished in an exemplary way as it ruins the image of honest operators, who are the overwhelming majority.</p> <p>A category cannot be blamed for isolated cases caused by unscrupulous people, who must be isolated and punished. This reasoning is valid for all activities and for all relationships between man and animal and between man and man!</p>

IT

Si richiamano:

- regolamento UE 2016/628 della commissione , Allegato V –

- certificato ufficiale di macellazione d'urgenza al di fuori del macello ai sensi dell'art 4 del regolamento delegato UE 2019/624 della commissione

In estrema sintesi, la legge prevede che quando da parte dell'allevatore ci sia il dubbio che un bovino non sia in grado di sopportare il viaggio verso la struttura di macellazione, egli deve interpellare il proprio veterinario aziendale per verificare le condizioni dell'animale ed in caso affermativo farsi rilasciare una certificazione di trasportabilità. Qualora invece il bovino non possa essere trasportato, è previsto l'abbattimento in azienda al quale deve obbligatoriamente essere presente il veterinario ufficiale che ne autorizza la macellazione assistendo a tutte le fasi. Quando previsto il veterinario pubblico può disporre l'abbattimento e successiva distruzione del capo.

I trasportatori sono dotati di patentino specifico per il trasporto animali e se effettuano macellazione in azienda debbono avere un'ulteriore specifico patentino.

E' prevista corresponsabilità tra allevatore, veterinario aziendale, veterinario ufficiale e trasportatore per far si che la legge sia rispettata il più possibile

Chi maltratta gli animali è punito dalla leggi già previste e gli allevatori sono i primi custodi del benessere animale. Nessuno ha interesse a maltrattare gli animali e, se qualcuno lo fa, deve essere punito in modo esemplare poiché rovina l'immagine degli operatori onesti, che sono la stragrande maggioranza.

Non si può colpevolizzare una categoria per casi isolati provocati da persone senza scrupoli, che vanno isolate e punite. Questo ragionamento vale per tutte le attività e per tutti i rapporti tra uomo e animale e tra uomo e uomo!

	QUESTIONS FROM RENEW
QUESTIONS	No written questions
ANSWERS	

QUESTIONS FROM GREENS/EFA	
QUESTIONS	<p>Slaughterhouses: Improving slaughterhouse availability with different slaughter possibilities is necessary if we want to shift to meat and carcasses trade, and to try to limit as much as possible live animal transport to slaughter facilities.</p> <p>> Have you witnessed difficulties for farmers to access slaughterhouses? If so, how do you explain them? What would be the solutions to develop local slaughterhouses and facilitate slaughter on-farm?</p> <p>> What actions need to be taken, at EU and Member State level, to promote mobile slaughter? What other actions need to be taken to improve the availability of local slaughter facilities across the EU, thus counteracting the increasing consolidation and geographical concentration of slaughter facilities in fewer, larger-scale units?</p>
ANSWERS	<p style="text-align: center;">EN</p> <p>In Italy the number of authorized slaughterhouses (with EC stamp) are more than sufficient to respond to requests for slaughter with transport of animals over short distances. Building new slaughterhouses or opening closed slaughterhouses involves very high costs for all the rules that must be respected and the management of a slaughterhouse is very expensive. It is preferable to have medium and large slaughterhouses since all stages of slaughter (transport of the animals to the slaughterhouse, unloading, health check, slaughter) are carried out by trained professionals and strict veterinary checks.</p> <p>I can therefore say that the slaughtering network (in Italy) is more than satisfactory and the possible use of "mobile slaughterhouses", in addition to being expensive, does not guarantee all the stages of slaughtering that I have described.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">IT</p> <p>In Italia il numero di macelli autorizzati (con bollo CE) sono più che sufficienti per rispondere alle richieste di macellazione con trasporto degli animali su brevi distanze. Costruire nuovi macelli o aprire macelli chiusi comporta costi molto elevati per tutte le norme che devono essere rispettate e la gestione di un macello è molto onerosa. E' preferibile avere macelli di medie e grandi dimensioni poiché tutte le fasi della macellazione (trasporto degli animali al macello, scarico, visita sanitaria, macellazione) vengono eseguite da professionisti preparati e da rigidi controlli veterinari.</p> <p>Posso quindi affermare che la rete di macellazione (in Italia) è più che soddisfacente e l'utilizzo eventuale di "macelli mobili", oltre ad essere oneroso, non garantisce tutte le fasi della macellazione che ho descritto.</p>

<p>QUESTIONS</p>	<p><u>Specialization of livestock production</u></p> <p>When we look at intra-EU trade, key issues are the structure of livestock production, characterised by an increasing specialisation of production and separation into breeding and fattening units, and slaughterhouse availability, as well as capacity. This process has encouraged large-scale intensive production. This has resulted in certain countries developing high self-sufficiency rates encouraging exports (for example, Ireland for cattle; Denmark and the Netherlands for piglets). The increase in long-distance intra-euro transport is driven by considerable growth in exports of cattle for other purposes than slaughter. This include replacements for dairy herd or animals for further fattening, for example. Analysis of TRACES data shows a substantial increase in long distance live animal transport within the EU between 2005 and 2015.</p> <p>> What alternatives could be developed to mitigate this phenomenon and limit as much as possible transport of animals across EU and outside, in this case concerning those transported for other purposes than slaughtering? How could we encourage “closed” farming systems that do not involve the separation of the different stages of production?</p>
<p>ANSWERS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">EN</p> <p>The movement of animals within Europe must be considered physiological due to the levels of specialization acquired by breeders in the various Member States. Europe must be considered a great region where the French and the Irish have the natural conditions to raise suckler cows and produce stalls (climatic and environmental), as well as Poland, while Spaniards, Germans and Italians are good at raising cattle in protected farms (not intensive, protected !!!) using high quality raw materials, ensuring animal welfare, protecting them from bad weather, prey stress and parasites and providing clean drinking water.</p> <p>Preventing the movement of animals by inserting additional constraints in addition to those already provided for in Regulation 1/2005, means destroying European animal husbandry and encouraging the importation of meat from third countries that have farms that contribute to deforestation and do not have quality and food safety standards. like those existing in Europe. (for Regulations).</p> <p>If the Commission wants to improve animal welfare standards in transport by decreasing the number of them, there are only two ways to go:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - finance the modernization of trucks for long-distance transport, conditioning them; - finance the purchase of suckler cows, to increase the creation of stalls in suitable areas. <p>The responsibility of those who propose rules to be included in European regulations must not stop at considering only one aspect (such as the reduction of transport), thinking that the problem has been solved, must take into account an audience of 500 million consumers who for 97 % are omnivores, of the need to guarantee food safety and the wholesomeness and quality of production, aim at European self-supply, keep humans in the territory (especially in the most difficult areas to manage), encourage research and experimentation, financing adequately all stages of the supply chain (essential to give food - F2F - to European citizens).</p>

Taking away economic resources from animal husbandry, preventing the promotion of production and the products obtained are very serious acts because they impoverish entrepreneurs by forcing them to do "acrobatics" to continue producing, feeding animals and feeding their families. Providing poor food to European consumers means exposing them to diseases with costs ten times higher than a normal aid plan to those who have to supply those products. European agricultural policy seems to have lost sight of these issues and is riding easy utterances that are useful only to fill newspapers and television stations with words to please public opinion.

The first principle of F2F should be the FOOD SELF-SUFFICIENCY of the Member States and of Europe for every type of product intended for human consumption and, consequently, the rules should be written with the feeling of "good family man" and not for ideological alignments!

IT

La movimentazione degli animali all'interno dell'Europa deve essere considerata fisiologica per i livelli di specializzazione acquisiti dagli allevatori nei vari Stati Membri. L'Europa deve essere considerata una grande regione dove i francesi e gli irlandesi hanno le condizioni naturali per allevare vacche nutrici e produrre ristalli (climatiche ed ambientali), come anche la Polonia, mentre spagnoli, tedeschi e italiani sono bravi ad allevare i bovini in allevamenti protetti (no intensivi, protetti!!!) utilizzando materie prime di alta qualità, assicurando il benessere animale, proteggendoli dalle intemperie, stress da preda e dai parassiti e fornendo acqua di abbeverata pulita.

Impedire la movimentazione degli animali inserendo ulteriori vincoli oltre a quelli già previsti nel Regolamento 1/2005, significa distruggere la zootecnia europea e favorire l'importazione di carne da Paesi Terzi che hanno allevamenti che contribuiscono alla deforestazione e non hanno standard qualitativi e di sicurezza alimentare come quelli esistenti in Europa. (per Regolamento).

Se la Commissione vuole migliorare gli standard di benessere animale nei trasporti diminuendone il numero ci sono solo due strade da percorrere:

- finanziare l'ammodernamento dei camion per il trasporto su lunghe distanze, climatizzandoli;
- finanziare l'acquisto di vacche nutrici, per aumentare la nascita di ristalli nei territori vocati.

La responsabilità di chi propone norme da inserire in regolamenti europei non deve fermarsi a considerar solo un aspetto (come ad esempio la riduzione dei trasporti) pensando di aver risolto il problema, deve tenere conto di una platea di 500 milioni di consumatori che per il 97% sono onnivori, della necessità di garantire la sicurezza alimentare e la salubrità e qualità delle produzioni, puntare all'auto approvvigionamento europeo, mantenere l'uomo nel territorio (soprattutto nelle zone più difficili da gestire), favorire la ricerca e la sperimentazione, finanziando adeguatamente tutte le fasi della filiera (essenziale per dare cibo – F2F – ai cittadini europei).

Togliere risorse economiche alla zootecnia, impedire di promuovere le produzioni ed i prodotti ottenuti sono atti gravissimi perché impoveriscono gli imprenditori costringendoli a fare "acrobazie" per continuare a produrre, alimentare gli animali e sfamare le proprie famiglie. Fornire una alimentazione scadente ai consumatori europei significa esporli a malattie con costi dieci volte superiori ad un normale

	<p>piano di aiuti a chi deve fornire quelle produzioni. La politica agricola europea sembra aver perso di vista questi argomenti e cavalca facili esternazioni utili solo a riempire giornali e televisioni di parole per accontentare l'opinione pubblica.</p> <p>Il primo principio di F2F dovrebbe essere l'AUTOSUFFICIENZA ALIMENTARE degli Stati Membri e dell'Europa per ogni tipo di prodotto destinato al consumo umano e, di conseguenza, le regole dovrebbero essere scritte con il sentimento del "buon padre di famiglia" e non per schieramenti ideologici!</p>
<p>QUESTIONS</p>	<p><u>Cold chain capacities in export markets</u></p> <p>A key driver of the live trade between Member States and non-EU countries, particularly those that tend to be the major destinations for current EU exports in live animals, is a lack of infrastructure to facilitate trade in meat and carcasses, specifically poor/ insufficient cold chain facilities. This encourages the import of live animals for slaughter.</p> <p>> What solutions could be developed to support and improve cold chain capacities? How do stakeholders deal with this matter on the ground?</p>
<p>ANSWERS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">EN</p> <p>Today in Europe the "cold chain" works very well and the proof is given by the handling of perishable goods. For example, in Italy, we import almost 48% (unfortunately) of beef from Member States and also from overseas. Obviously, if Europe decides to allocate resources to improve it, in terms of hardware and software, the operators thank them and are certainly willing to invest. The movement of animals for slaughter (especially towards third countries) is almost always determined by the need (them) to carry out slaughtering with religious rites that in Europe have different rules from theirs.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">IT</p> <p>Oggi in Europa la "catena del freddo" funziona benissimo e la dimostrazione è data dalla movimentazione delle merci deperibili. Ad esempio, in Italia, importiamo quasi il 48% (purtroppo) di carne bovina dagli Stati Membri ed anche da oltre Oceano. Ovviamente, se l'Europa decide di destinare risorse per migliorarla, sotto il profilo hardware e software, gli operatori ringraziano e sicuramente sono disponibili ad investire. La movimentazione di animali da macello (soprattutto verso Pesì Terzi) è determinata quasi sempre dalla necessità (loro) di effettuare macellazioni con riti religiosi che in Europa hanno regole diverse dalle loro.</p>

<p>QUESTIONS</p>	<p><u>Transports outside EU</u> Report on animal welfare during exports (DG SANTE 6834) state that “the available information indicates that most transporters do not meet applicable EU rules after leaving the Union. The absence of agreements with EU neighbouring countries, together with poor retrospective checks and the inability of Member States to ascertain the conditions of transport and the feasibility of the plan for that part of the journey contribute to that concern.” Regarding the lack of feedback from third countries on the condition of animals during transport and at arrival (DG(SANTE) 2019-6835), it is impossible for Member States to assess compliance. To enforce this Court ruling, would mean for Member States to refuse any export of animals towards non-EU countries (clear link with meat trade). If we look at transports in the Middle East and in North Africa, they do not fulfil European law but are totally outside the sphere of influence of the organiser: no authorization of the local transport company, no approval of the lorries and no certification of competence of the person responsible for the load, and, no contingency planning. > When a part of the journey is to be made outside EU, how can we make sure the comply with EU Regulation, can prove it to competent authorities? Many professionals auditionned underlined the need to shift from live animal transport to a meat, carcasses and genetic material transport. From your point of view, how feasible and advisable is this solution?</p>
<p>ANSWERS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">EN</p> <p>Often the transport outside Europe of live cattle for slaughter is determined (as already mentioned) for reasons of a religious nature. Considering that transport is almost always carried out by ship, the European Commission must establish stricter rules to be applied to these trips, starting with the presence of official veterinarians who follow all the phases of the journey (alongside the ship and on board the ship) in an adequate number, compared to animals loaded, in constant contact with the maritime authorities to ensure compliance with the rules and safety of the journey. For both land and sea transport, Europe should have a "European database" obliging all Member States to use it to update it with all the data necessary to identify men, vehicles, professionals, persons transported, infringements, accidents, mortality, etc. and assign a "points license" to authorize (at European level) the transport of animals.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">IT</p> <p>Spesso Il trasporto fuori dall’Europa di bovini vivi da macello è determinato (come già ricordato) da motivi di carattere religioso. Considerato che quasi sempre i trasporti avvengono con navi, la Commissione europea deve stabilire regole più stringenti da applicare a questi viaggi, partendo dalla presenza di veterinari ufficiali che seguano tutte la fasi del viaggio (fianco nave e bordo nave) in numero congruo, rispetto agli animali caricati, in costante contatto con le autorità marittime per garantire il rispetto delle regole e la sicurezza del viaggio.</p>

	<p>Sia per i trasporti terrestri, sia per quelli marittimi, l'Europa dovrebbe dotarsi di una "banca dati europea" obbligando tutti gli Stati Membri ad utilizzarla per aggiornarla con tutti i dati necessari per identificare uomini, mezzi, professionalità, soggetti trasportati, infrazioni, infortuni, mortalità, ecc. ed attribuire una "patente a punti" per autorizzare (a livello europeo) il trasporto di animali.</p>
--	--

	QUESTIONS FROM ID
QUESTIONS	No written questions
ANSWERS	

	QUESTIONS FROM ECR
QUESTIONS	No written questions
ANSWERS	

	QUESTIONS FROM THE LEFT
QUESTIONS	No written questions
ANSWERS	