

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

1999



2004

Session document

FINAL
A5-0386/2003

5 November 2003

REPORT

on the proposal for a Council regulation on establishing a system for the identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals and amending Regulation (EEC) No 3508/92
(COM(2002) 729 – C5-0027/2003 – 2002/0297(CNS))

Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

Rapporteur: Gordon J. Adam

Symbols for procedures

- * Consultation procedure
majority of the votes cast
- **I Cooperation procedure (first reading)
majority of the votes cast
- **II Cooperation procedure (second reading)
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend
the common position*
- *** Assent procedure
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases
covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and
Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- ***I Codecision procedure (first reading)
majority of the votes cast
- ***II Codecision procedure (second reading)
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend
the common position*
- ***III Codecision procedure (third reading)
majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission)

Amendments to a legislative text

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). These suggested corrections are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

CONTENTS

	Page
PROCEDURAL PAGE	4
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	29

PROCEDURAL PAGE

By letter of 7 February 2003 the Council consulted Parliament, pursuant to Article 37 of the EC Treaty, on the proposal for a Council regulation on establishing a system for the identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals and amending Regulation (EEC) No 3508/92 (COM(2002) 729 – 2002/0297(CNS)).

At the sitting of 10 February 2003 the President of Parliament announced that he had referred the proposal to the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development as the committee responsible and the Committee on Budgetary Control and to the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy for their opinions (C5-0027/2003).

The Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development appointed Gordon J. Adam rapporteur at its meeting of 23 January 2003.

The committee considered the Commission proposal and draft report at its meetings of 19 March 2003, 11 September and 4 November 2003.

At the last meeting it adopted the draft legislative resolution unanimously.

The following were present for the vote Joseph Daul (chairman), Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf, Albert Jan Maat, (vice- chairmen), Gordon J. Adam (rapporteur), Elspeth Attwooll (for Giovanni Procacci), Danielle Auroi, Alexandros Baltas (for Jean-Claude Fruteau), Niels Busk, António Campos, Giorgio Celli, Ferrández Lezaun, Jonathan Evans (for Neil Parish pursuant to Rule 153(2)), Christel Fiebiger, Francesco Fiori, Georges Garot, Lutz Goepel, João Gouveia, María Esther Herranz García (for Elisabeth Jeggle), María Izquierdo Rojo, Salvador Jové Peres, Hedwig Keppelhoff-Wiechert, Heinz Kindermann, Dimitrios Koulourianos, Wolfgang Kreissl-Dörfler (for Willi Görlach), Vincenzo Lavarra, Astrid Lulling (for Michl Ebner), Véronique Mathieu, Xaver Mayer, Karl Erik Olsson, Encarnación Redondo Jiménez, Dominique F.C. Souchet, and Robert William Sturdy.

The Committee on Budgetary Control decided on 12 March 2003 not to deliver an opinion. The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Consumer Policy decided on 28 January 2003 not to deliver an opinion.

The report was tabled on 5 November 2003.

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

**on the proposal for a Council regulation on establishing a system for the identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals and amending Regulation (EEC) No 3508/92 (COM(2002) 729 – C5-0027/2003 – 2002/0297(CNS))
(Consultation procedure)**

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2002) 729)¹,
 - having regard to Article 37 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C5-0027/2003),
 - having regard to Rule 67 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (A5-0386/2003),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
 2. Calls on the Commission to alter its proposal accordingly, pursuant to Article 250(2) of the EC Treaty;
 3. Calls on the Council to notify Parliament if it intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
 4. Asks the Council to consult Parliament again if it intends to amend the Commission proposal substantially;
 5. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

¹ OJ C ... / Not yet published in OJ..

Amendment 1
Recital 4

(4) In 1998 the Commission launched a large scale project on livestock electronic identification (IDEA), and its final report was completed 30 April 2002. That project has demonstrated that ***a substantial improvement in*** ovine and caprine ***animal identification systems*** can be achieved by using electronic identifiers for those animals provided certain conditions concerning the accompanying measures are fulfilled.

(4) In 1998 the Commission launched a large-scale project on livestock electronic identification (IDEA), and its final report was completed 30 April 2002. That project has demonstrated that ***reliable registration and identification of*** ovine and caprine ***animals*** can be achieved by using electronic identifiers for those animals provided certain conditions concerning the accompanying measures are fulfilled.

Justification

Since the conclusion of the IDEA project, electronic tagging systems have been further developed. However, compatibility of all equipment has yet to be demonstrated.

Amendment 2
Recital 4a (new)

(4a) The Commission should make all possible endeavours to consult widely all possible manufacturers in order to develop a cost-effective and practical means of electronic identification as a matter of priority.

Justification

It is important to consult as widely as possible to quickly develop a workable solution.

Amendment 3
Recital 5

(5) The technology of electronic identification in ovine and caprine animals has been developed to such a stage that it can be ***applied***. Pending the development of the implementing measures required for the proper introduction of ***the system of electronic identification on a Community-wide scale*** an efficient identification and registration system, ***enabling future developments in the field of implementation of electronic identification on a Community-wide scale to be taken into account, should permit*** the individual identification of the animals and the holding of birth of the animals

(5) The technology of electronic identification in ovine and caprine animals has been developed to such a stage that it can ***be trialed at practical level across all sheep productions systems in all member states***. Pending the development of the implementing measures required for the proper ***and cost-effective*** introduction of electronic identification ***systems*** on a ***voluntary basis***, an efficient Community-wide identification and registration system ***based on harmonized minimum standards should be introduced, allowing*** the individual identification of the animals and the holding of birth of the animals.

Justification

This technology has not been proven to work in all member states or that it can be practically or cost effectively applied in all situations.

Amendment 4
Recital 5a (new)

(5a) The Joint Research Centre of the Commission should provide detailed technical guidelines, definitions and procedures in the areas of technical characteristics of identifiers and readers; test procedures, acceptance criteria and certification model for agreed test laboratories; procurement of appropriate identifiers and readers; application of identifiers, their reading and recovery; codification of identifiers; common glossary, data dictionary and communication standards.

Justification

The recital has been moved from its original place in the Preamble in order to specify the role of the Joint Research Centre before the possible move to EID is explained in detail.

Amendment 5 Recital 5 a (new)

(5a) The entire cost of introducing the new electronic identification system should be met from the Community budget since this is a food safety and control measure affecting the whole production chain and since it is the producers who will have to put into operation and manage the system.

Justification

The introduction of the electronic identification system responds to our desire for high levels of food safety and the traceability of foodstuffs within the EU. The cost of introducing it should therefore be met through European financing.

Amendment 6 Recital 6

(6) To take into account future developments within the field of electronic identification of ovine and caprine animals, and in particular the experience gained in its implementation thereof, the Commission should submit to the Council a report concerning the possible implementation of the system of electronic identification on a Community-wide scale.

(6) To take into account future developments within the field of electronic identification of ovine and caprine animals, and in particular the experience gained in its implementation thereof, the Commission should submit to the ***European Parliament and the*** Council a report ***on the progress made by the Joint Research Centre and the Member States*** concerning the possible implementation of the ***future*** system of electronic identification on a Community-wide scale.

Justification

Prior to the general and compulsory introduction of the electronic identification system, the Commission should present a report on the experience acquired in the area which analyses the financial impact of system.

Amendment 7
Recital 7

(7) The Joint Research Centre of the Commission shall provide detailed technical guidelines, definitions and procedures in the areas of technical characteristics of identifiers and readers; test procedures, acceptance criteria and certification model for agreed test laboratories; procurement of appropriate identifiers and readers; application of identifiers, their reading and recovery; codification of identifiers; common glossary, data dictionary and communication standards. **Deleted**

Justification

This recital is moved.

Amendment 8
Recital 10

(10) In each Member State, a central register should be established comprising an up-to-date list of all holdings which keep animals covered by this Regulation and are situated on its territory, specifying the species, the number of animals kept and their keepers, and the type of production. **Deleted.**

Justification

The national registers in the Member States are to be replaced by a database in each Member State, in compliance with Community requirements.

Amendment 9
Recital 11

(11) For the purpose of rapid and accurate tracing of animals each Member State should create a computer database which

(11) For the purpose of rapid and accurate tracing of animals each Member State should create a computer database which

will record all holdings on its territory and the movements of the animals.

will record all holdings on its territory and the movements of the animals. ***The requirements with regard to the data to be submitted to the database by each keeper should be determined on a Community basis. The database should also contain up-to-date information on all holdings which keep animals covered by this Regulation and are situated on its territory, specifying the species, the number of animals kept and their keepers, and the type of production.***

Justification

It is important that the data requirements be determined on a Community basis.

Amendment 10
Recital 11a (new)

(11a) Until such time as each Member State is able to establish a computer database, a central register should be created, comprising an up-to-date list of all holdings which keep animals covered by this Regulation and are situated on its territory, specifying the species, the number of animals kept and their keepers, and the type of production.

Justification

The central register should be replaced by the more advanced computer database as soon as the Member States are ready. Therefore, the two systems need to be linked together in the Regulation.

Amendment 11
Recital 13

Persons involved in the trade of animals should keep records of their transactions, ***and the competent authority should have access to these records on request.***

Persons involved in the trade of animals should keep ***and submit*** records of their transactions ***to the database or the central register.***

Justification

It is crucial that authorities have accurate and rapidly accessible information on animal movements, since this is the core element of the traceability system needed for improved disease control.

Amendment 12 Recital 14

(14) In order to ensure the correct application of this Regulation, it is necessary to provide **with** a rapid and efficient exchange of information about means of identification and related documents between Member States. Community provisions relating thereto have been established by Council Regulation (EC) No 515/97 of 13 March 1997 on mutual assistance between the administrative authorities of the Member States and co-operation between the latter and the Commission to ensure the correct application of the law on customs and agricultural matters¹ and by Council Directive 89/608/EEC of 21 November 1989 on mutual assistance between the administrative authorities of the Member States and co-operation between the latter and the Commission to ensure the correct application of legislation on veterinary and zootechnical matters.

(14) In order to ensure the correct application of this Regulation, it is necessary to provide a rapid and efficient exchange of information about means of identification and related documents between Member States. Community provisions relating thereto have been established by Council Regulation (EC) No 515/97 of 13 March 1997 on mutual assistance between the administrative authorities of the Member States and co-operation between the latter and the Commission to ensure the correct application of the law on customs and agricultural matters¹ and by Council Directive 89/608/EEC of 21 November 1989 on mutual assistance between the administrative authorities of the Member States and co-operation between the latter and the Commission to ensure the correct application of legislation on veterinary and zootechnical matters.

Justification

More correct language.

(This amendment concerns only the English version.)

Amendment 13 Recital 17 a

(17a) Bearing in mind that the ovine and caprine sector is a labour-intensive one

¹ OJ L 82, 22.3.1997, p. 1.

¹ OJ L 82, 22.3.1997, p. 1.

with a specialised and fast-ageing workforce and a very low level of profitability, an increase in the costs payable by producers could increase the rate at which they leave the land. It would therefore be appropriate for the European Union to meet the entire cost of introducing the individual identification system.

Justification

Self-explanatory.

Amendment 14
Article 2, point (c)

(c) “keeper” means any natural or legal person responsible, even on a temporary basis, for animals;

(c) “keeper” means any natural or legal person, ***with the exception of transporters***, responsible, even on a temporary basis, for animals;

Justification

Transporters cannot be expected to meet the same requirements as keepers.

Amendment 15
Article 3, paragraph 1, point (d)

(d) a central register;

(d) ***a computer database*** or a central register;

Justification

The central register should be replaced by the more advanced computer database as soon as the Member States are ready. Therefore, the two systems need to be linked together in the Regulation.

Amendment 16
Article 3, paragraph 1, point (e)

(e) ***a computer database.***

Deleted

Justification

The computer database is mentioned together with the central register.

Amendment 17 Article 4, paragraph 1

1. All animals on a holding born after **1 July 2003** or intended for intra-Community trade after **1 July 2003** shall be identified in accordance with Section A of the Annex within a period to be determined by the Member State as from the birth of the animal and in any case before the animal leaves the holding on which it was born. That period shall not be longer than **one month**.

By way of derogation Member States may extend the period to **six** months for animals kept in extensive farming conditions and in free range. Member States concerned shall inform the Commission of the derogation granted. If necessary implementing rules may be laid down in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 13(2).

1. All animals on a holding born after **1 July 2005** or intended for intra-Community trade after **1 July 2005** shall be identified in accordance with Section A of the Annex within a period to be determined by the Member State as from the birth of the animal and in any case before the animal leaves the holding on which it was born. That period shall not be longer than **six months**.

By way of derogation Member States may extend the period to **nine** months for animals kept in extensive or free range farming conditions. Member States concerned shall inform the Commission of the derogation granted. If necessary, implementing rules may be laid down in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 13(2).

Amendment 18 Article 4, paragraph 3, subparagraph 1

Any animal imported from a third country after **1 July 2003** which has passed the checks laid down by Directive 91/496/EEC and which remains within the Community territory shall be identified in accordance with Section A of the Annex on the holding of destination within a period to be determined by the Member State of at most 14 days after undergoing those checks, and, in any event, before leaving the holding.

Any animal imported from a third country after **1 July 2005** which has passed the checks laid down by Directive 91/496/EEC and which remains within the Community territory shall be identified in accordance with Section A of the Annex on the holding of destination within a period to be determined by the Member State of at most 14 days after undergoing those checks, and, in any event, before leaving the holding.

Justification

More time is needed in order to implement the new system correctly.

Amendment 19
Article 4, paragraph 5

5. No means of identification may be removed or replaced without the permission of the competent authority. Where a means of identification has become illegible or has been lost, a replacement **bearing the same code** shall be applied in accordance with this Article. In addition to the code and distinct from it the replacement may bear a mark with the version number of the replacement.

5. No means of identification may be removed or replaced without the permission of the competent authority. Where a means of identification has become illegible or has been lost, a replacement shall be applied in accordance with this Article. In addition to the code and distinct from it the replacement may bear a mark with the version number of the replacement.

Justification

It is unlikely that the unique identification number of an animal which has lost its tag can be established. Therefore, replacement tags cannot be expected to carry the unique identification number. It would also be expensive to order replacement tags with the same unique identification number individually.

Amendment 20
Article 4, paragraph 6a (new)

6a. Without prejudice to the provisions in this article, Member States may authorise the use of supplementary marking of animals. Supplementary marks may be applied on a temporary or permanent basis. The use of supplementary marks shall be subject to notification of the Commission and the competent authorities of the Member States.

Justification

As a result of the substantial differences between Member States as far as the sheep and goat-keeping sector is concerned, some Member States may need supplementary marking, e.g. to mark animals being transferred to 2nd or 3rd holdings. Such systems should be allowed to continue.

Amendment 21
Article 4, paragraph 7a (new)

7a. Prior to implementing the regulation,

the Commission must undertake an extensive programme of tests and field trials for flocks in both lowland and mountainous regions and publish the results of these trials before proceeding to implementation.

Justification

It is essential that any scheme be proved to be practical and workable in all types of sheep production, both mountainous and lowland.

Amendment 22
Article 5, paragraph 1

1. Each keeper of animals shall keep an up-to-date register in accordance with Section B of the Annex.

1. Each keeper of animals shall keep an up-to-date register ***and submit information*** in accordance with Section B of the Annex ***to the competent authority.***

Justification

The justification to this amendment is covered by the amendments to Section B of the Annex.

Amendment 23
Article 6, paragraph 1

1. As from 1 July **2003** whenever an animal is moved, it shall be accompanied by a movement document issued by the competent authority and completed by the keeper in accordance with Section C of the Annex.

1. As from 1 July **2005** whenever an animal is moved, it shall be accompanied by a movement document issued by the competent authority and completed by the keeper in accordance with Section C of the Annex.

Justification

The Member States should be given sufficient time to introduce the new system. The wording should also permit Member States to introduce the new movement document earlier than this if they so wish.

Amendment 24
Article 6, paragraph 2

2. The keeper of the holding of destination shall keep the movement document for a minimum period to be determined by the competent authority but which may not be less than three years.

2. The keeper of the holding of destination shall keep the movement document for a minimum period to be determined by the competent authority but which may not be less than three years. ***The keeper shall submit a copy of the movement document or electronic record to the competent authority. The competent authority shall register the movements referred to in paragraph 1 in the computer database or the central register set up in accordance with Article 8.***

Justification

The justification to this amendment is covered by the amendments to Section C of the Annex.

Amendment 25
Article 7

Member States shall ensure that the competent authority has a central register of all the holdings situated on its territory which keep animals.

Deleted

This register shall include the identification code of the holding and specify the species and the number of animals kept, their keepers and the type of production. The number of animals kept shall be updated at regular intervals.

A holding shall remain on the central register until three consecutive years have elapsed with no animals on the holding.

Justification

This information will be recorded on the computer database established by Article 8 and Section D of the Annex from the date when this Regulation enters into force. It is, therefore,

no longer necessary to establish a central register.

Amendment 26
Article 8

The competent authority of the Member States shall set up a computer database in accordance with Section D of the Annex and by the dates specified therein.

The competent authority of the Member States shall set up a computer database in accordance with Section D of the Annex and by the dates specified therein.

Until such time as each Member State is able to establish a computer database, Member States shall ensure that the competent authority has a central register of all the holdings situated on its territory which keep animals. This register shall include the identification code of the holding and specify the species and the number of animals kept, their keepers and the type of production. The number of animals kept shall be updated at regular intervals. A holding shall remain on the central register or the computer database until three consecutive years have elapsed with no animals on the holding.

Justification

The central register will eventually be replaced by a computer database in all Member States. Therefore, the provisions governing the computer database must be linked to those governing the central register.

Amendment 27
Article 9

1. Further guidelines and procedures for the implementation of electronic identification shall be adopted according to the procedure referred to in Article 13(2).

1. No later than 31 December 2006, the Commission shall submit a new legislative proposal with a view to the general introduction of electronic identification on 1 July 2007.

2. The decisions referred to in paragraph 1 shall be adopted in order to implement general electronic identification by 1 July 2006. If necessary, the Commission shall submit to the Council by 31 December 2005 a report on the experience gained with regard to the implementation of electronic identification, accompanied by appropriate proposals amending if appropriate, the date by which general electronic identification should be implemented.

2. In order to implement Community-wide electronic identification, the Commission shall submit to the Council and the European Parliament, no later than 31 July 2006, a report on the experience gained with regards to the implementation of electronic identification.

2a. (new) The report referred to in paragraph 2 shall include a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis of the system proposed, including the financial and welfare implications. The report shall set out the guidelines and procedures for the general implementation of the system, including proposals for any EU financial assistance.

Amendment 28
Article 12, paragraph 2

2. Member States shall lay down the rules on sanctions applicable to infringements of this Regulation and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The sanctions provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

2. Member States shall lay down the rules on sanctions applicable to infringements of this Regulation. ***Such national rules shall be submitted for approval to the European Commission, which shall ensure that any disparities in the national sanctions scheme do not disturb the operation of the single market. The Member States shall also*** take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The sanctions provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

Justification

Disparities in sanctions schemes must not disturb the market or result in distortions of competition.

Amendment 29
Article 14a (new)

14a. Within six months of the entry into force of this Regulation, the European Commission must present a proposal for the financing under the Community budget of the establishment of individual identification for ovine and caprine livestock.

Justification

The identification provided for in the Regulation will serve not only for the control of animal diseases but also for the control of CAP aid. The European Union should grant aid to sheep and goat producers in the same way as it already does for cattle, taking into account, moreover, that this is the livestock sector with the lowest level of incomes.

Amendment 30
ANNEX
Section A, paragraph 1

1. Animals are identified by an eartag approved by the competent authority, applied to ***each ear***. Member States may authorise the ***replacement of the second eartag with*** an electronic identifier approved by the competent authority and responding to the technical characteristics listed in point 5. ***From the date referred to in Article 9(2) the replacement of the second eartag with an electronic identifier is obligatory. Both eartags or the eartag and the electronic identifier approved by the competent authority shall bear the same unique identification code, which makes it possible to identify each animal individually together with the holding on which it was born.***

1. Animals are identified by an eartag ***or tattoo*** approved by the competent authority, applied to ***one or both ears***. Member States may authorise the ***use of*** an electronic identifier approved by the competent authority and responding to the technical characteristics listed in point 5. ***The animal shall have at least one eartag which may also carry the electronic identifier. The eartag or the electronic identifier approved by the competent authority shall bear a unique identification code, which makes it possible to identify each animal individually together with the holding on which it was born.***

Justification

Sheep and goats should be fitted with only one eartag for welfare reasons. Goats sometimes chew the eartags, making the markings illegible and creating welfare problems. Accordingly, tattooing should remain an option.

Amendment 31
ANNEX
Section A, paragraph 2

2. The ***eartags*** shall be applied on a place ***Deleted***
easily visible at distance.

Justification

Visibility of eartags will be influenced by a variety of factors, including the size and colour of the tag, the size and colour of the animal's ear, and the light and weather conditions. Tags may therefore not always be visible at a distance.

Amendment 32
ANNEX Section A, paragraph 3

3. The ***eartags and the electronic identifier*** shall contain a code that allows ***to identify*** at least the name, the code or the logo of the competent authority or of the central competent authority of the Member State which allocated the eartag ***and the electronic identifier***, and the following characters:

- the first positions shall identify the Member State of the holding where the animal is first identified. ***For this purpose two-letter or three digit country codes 1 shall be used in accordance with ISO 3166;***

- the characters following the country code shall be numeric and shall not exceed 12.

In addition to the information provided for in this paragraph, a bar code may be authorised by the competent authorities of the Member States.

3. The ***eartag may*** contain a code that allows ***the identification of*** at least the name, the code or the logo of the competent authority or of the central competent authority of the Member State which allocated the eartag, ***and must contain*** the following characters:

- the first positions shall identify the Member State of the holding where the animal is first identified;

The code on the electronic identifier shall be in compliance with ISO 11784.

- the characters following the country code shall be numeric and shall not exceed 12.

In addition to the information provided for in this paragraph, a bar code may be authorised by the competent authorities of the Member States.

Justification

Electronic identification should comply with ISO 11784 in order to allow for flexible use of numbers including manufacturers codes awaiting a unique system for coding sequences.

Amendment 33
ANNEX
Section A, paragraph 3 a (new)

3a. In the situations referred to in Article 4(5), Member States may authorise the use of a special replacement tag. Replacement tags should, as a minimum, carry the identification number of the holding where the animal is kept.

Justification

It is unlikely that animals with lost tags can be identified. Accordingly, replacement tags cannot be expected to carry more than the identification number of the holding.

Amendment 34
ANNEX
Section A, paragraph 4

The ***eartags*** shall be of flexible plastic material, tamper-proof and easy to read throughout the lifetime of the animal and of a design, which will remain attached to the animal without being harmful to it. The ***eartags*** shall not be re-usable and shall consist of two parts, a male part and a female part, and each part shall carry only non-removable inscriptions as provided for in point 3.

4. The ***eartag*** shall be of ***metal or*** flexible plastic material, tamper-proof and easy to read throughout the lifetime of the animal and of a design, which will remain attached to the animal without being harmful to it. The ***eartag*** shall not be re-usable and shall consist of ***either one or*** two parts, a male part and a female part, and each part shall carry only non-removable inscriptions as provided for in point 3.

Justification

Eartags in two parts are large and may be too heavy for young animals. Accordingly, smaller and lighter single-piece tags should be allowed.

Amendment 35
ANNEX Section A, paragraph 6

6. However for animals intended for slaughter before the age of six months the following identification method may be authorised by the competent authority:

- the animals are identified by an eartag approved by the competent authority, applied to each ear. Both eartags shall bear the same inscription;

- the eartags shall be of flexible plastic material, tamper-proof, easy to read and of a design, which will remain attached to the animal without being harmful to it. The eartags shall not be reusable and shall carry only non-removable inscriptions

- the eartags shall contain at least the two-letter country code, the identification code of the holding of birth and the month of birth.

Member States using this method shall inform the Commission and Member States in the framework of the Committee referred to in Article 13(1).

If animals identified in accordance with this point are kept beyond the age of six months or are intended for intra-Community trade or export to third countries, they must be identified in accordance with points 1 to 4.

All animals intended for intra-Community trade or export to third countries must be identified in accordance with points 1 to 4.

Justification

The derogation is no longer necessary, since batch recording will be possible for animals going to slaughter from the original holding. However, animals leaving their Member State of origin should be recorded on an individual basis in order to enhance traceability.

Amendment 36 **ANNEX, Section B, paragraph 2**

2. For each animal the up-to-date information on:

- the identification code of the animal,
- the month and year of birth,

2. For each animal *or batch of animals* the *following* up-to-date information on:

(a) For individual animals:

- the identification code of the animal,
- the month and year of birth,

- the sex,
- the breed and genotype if known,
- the identification code of the holding of destination, or in the event of animals moved to a slaughterhouse the identification code of the slaughterhouse,
- the month of death of the animal on the holding,
- replacement of eartags and electronic identifiers,
- in the case of animals departing from the holding the identification code of the holding to which the animal was transferred, as well as the date of departure,
- in the case of animals arriving on the holding the identification code of the holding, from which the animal was transferred, as well as the date of arrival.

- the sex,
- the breed and genotype if known,
- the identification code of the holding of destination, or in the event of animals moved to a slaughterhouse the identification code of the slaughterhouse,
- the month of death of the animal on the holding,
- replacement of eartags and electronic identifiers,
- in the case of animals departing from the holding the identification code of the holding to which the animal was transferred, as well as the date of departure,
- in the case of animals arriving on the holding the identification code of the holding, from which the animal was transferred, as well as the date of arrival.

or

(b) For each batch of animals:

- the identification code of the holding from which the batch departs,***
- the number of animals in the batch,***
- in the case of animals departing from the holding, the identification code or the address of the holding to which the batch was transferred, as well as the date of departure, or in the event of animals moved to slaughter, the identification code of the slaughterhouse,***
- in the case of animals arriving on the holding, the identification code or address of the holding from which the batch was transferred, as well as the date of arrival,***
- the date of departure***

– the data concerning the means of transport and the transporter.

However for animals identified in accordance with point 6 of Section A, the information provided for in point 2 of this Section shall be provided for each batch of animals having the same identification, and shall include the number of animals.

Justification

Individual animal traceability can be achieved only at an excessive cost and will entail very burdensome procedures for the farmers. However, since farming traditions, veterinary practices and, especially, the size of sheep and goat holdings vary from Member State to Member State, provision should be made for either individual recording or batch recording to be used until such time as electronic identification is implemented.

Amendment 37
ANNEX
Section C, paragraph 1

1. The movement document issued by the competent authority shall contain at least the ***following***:

– the name of issuing authority;

– the date of issue of the movement document;

– the identification code of the holding;

– name and address of the keeper.

1. The movement document issued by the competent authority shall contain at least the ***name of the issuing authority;***

Deleted

Deleted

Deleted

Deleted

Justification

There is no need for movement documents to include any pre-printed information other than the name of the issuing authority, since other fields can be filled in by the keeper.

Amendment 38
ANNEX Section C, paragraphs 2 and 3

2. In addition to the information mentioned in paragraph 1 the movement document shall contain at least the following fields to be completed by the keeper for animals to be moved from the holding:

- the identification code,
- the month and year of birth,
- the sex,
- the breed and genotype if known,
- the identification code of the holding of destination, or in the event of animals moved to a slaughterhouse the identification code of the slaughterhouse,
- the date of departure,
- the data concerning the means of transport and the transporter.

(b) The signature of the keeper.

2. The movement document issued by the competent authority shall allow keepers to record either movements of individual animals or movements of animals in batches and shall contain at least the following fields to be completed by the keeper for animals to be moved from the holding:

- *the date,*
- *the identification code of the holding,*
- *name and address of the keeper*

(a) For recording of movements of individual animals:

- the identification code,
- the month and year of birth,
- the sex,
- the breed and genotype if known,
- the identification code of the holding of destination, or in the event of animals moved to a slaughterhouse the identification code of the slaughterhouse,
- the date of departure,
- the data concerning the means of transport and the transporter.

or

(b) For recording of movements in batches:

- *the identification code of the holding of birth,*
- *the month of birth,*

- the number of animals,
- the identification code of the holding of destination, or in the event of animals moved to a slaughterhouse the identification code of the slaughterhouse,
- the date of departure,
- the data concerning the means of transport and the transporter.

3. However for animals identified in accordance with point 6 of Section A, the movement document shall contain at least the following fields to be completed by the keeper for animals to be moved from the holding:

3. Movement documents must be signed by the keeper responsible for moving either individual animals or batches of animals.

(a) For each batch of animals:

Deleted

- the identification code of the holding of birth,
- the month of birth,
- the number of animals,
- the identification code of the holding of destination, or in the event of animals moved to a slaughterhouse the identification code of the slaughterhouse,
- the date of departure,
- the data concerning the means of transport and the transporter.

(b) The signature of the keeper

Deleted

Justification

Until such time as electronic identification is implemented, Member States should be able to let keepers record either individual animal movements or movement of batches.

Amendment 39
ANNEX
Section D, paragraph 1

1. From **1 July 2004** the computer database shall contain at least the following information for each holding:

- the country code and the identification code consisting of not more than 12 figures (apart from the country code);
- address of the holding;
- the geographic co-ordinates or equivalent geographic indication of the holding;
- name and address of the keeper;
- species of animals;
- type of production;
- number of animals;
- a data field where it is possible for the competent authority to enter sanitary information for example restrictions on movements, status or other relevant information in the context of Community or national programmes;
- a data field for recording premium related information and/or farm policy and support information.

1. From **1 July 2005** the computer database shall contain at least the following information for each holding:

- the country code and the identification code consisting of not more than 12 figures (apart from the country code);
- address of the holding;
- the geographic co-ordinates or equivalent geographic indication of the holding;
- name and address of the keeper;
- species of animals;
- type of production;
- number of animals;
- a data field where it is possible for the competent authority to enter sanitary information for example restrictions on movements, status or other relevant information in the context of Community or national programmes;
- a data field for recording premium related information and/or farm policy and support information.

Justification

More time is needed in order to allow all Member States to implement a database.

Amendment 40
ANNEX Section D, number 2

2. **From** 1 July 2005 there shall be an entry in the database for each separate movement of animals. The entry shall comprise at least

2. **No later than** 1 July 2005 there shall be an entry in the database for each separate movement of animals. The entry shall

the following:

- the number of animals being moved,
- the identification code of the holding of departure,
- the date of departure,
- the identification code of the holding of arrival,
- the date of arrival.

comprise at least the following:

- the number of animals being moved,
- the identification code of the holding of departure,
- the date of departure,
- the identification code of the holding of arrival, ***or - where animals are being transported to an abattoir - the identification code of the abattoir.***
- the date of arrival.

Justification

The Member States should be given sufficient time to introduce the new system. The wording should also permit Member States to have movements of animals recorded, with the abovementioned details, on the computer database earlier than this if they so wish.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The outbreak of Foot and Mouth Disease (FMD) in the Community in 2001 highlighted the need to improve the system for recording and tracing animal movements, in particular that of sheep and goats. Comparisons between the recent crisis and the last serious outbreak of FMD to affect the UK in 1967 reveal the extent to which animal movements have increased, in volume, frequency and distance. One of the reasons why the disease spread so rapidly and to such an extent in the UK was the time taken to trace movements of infected animals, or animals which had been exposed to a risk of infection, the so-called 'dangerous contacts'.

The need to trace movements of sheep and goats is not restricted to cases of foot and mouth, several other infectious diseases of sheep and goats are listed on the Office International des Epizooties' (OIE) "A list" including e.g. Bluetongue, sheep pox and goat pox and the 'Peste des petits ruminants'. Some Member States have already introduced a unique identification system for sheep and goats as part of a programme to control ovine and caprine brucellosis.

The competent authorities need to be able to respond timeously to outbreaks of animal disease. They must be able to trace animal movements and identify dangerous contacts which can spread disease.

The European Parliament adopted a resolution¹ on 17 December 2002, based on the report drawn up by its Temporary Committee on FMD, which called on the Commission to submit a proposal to amend Directive 92/102/EEC² so as to improve the identification of pigs, sheep and goats. Parliament also called on the Commission 'to look to electronic identification as a durable and multi-faceted means of delivering rapid, efficient and infallible traceability of livestock.'³

At present, the Member States have different systems for sheep and goat identification and recording. Both eartags and tattoos are permitted in some Member States, and, while some have tagging with unique identifiers, others require identification at herd level only. Member States have also taken different approaches towards establishing a register of holdings, and movement documents are obligatory in about only half of the Member States.

The Commission proposal

The Commission proposal requires all sheep and goats born in the Community after 1 July 2003 to be double-tagged with tags bearing a unique identification number, at the latest before they are one month old. Member States may derogate from these requirements, with an extension of up to six months for the tagging of animals reared extensively.

The proposal requires keepers of sheep and goats to keep an up-to-date register showing details of their holding and the number of animals they keep. As individual tagging is introduced, this register would also contain information on the individual animals themselves e.g. their sex, breed, date of birth. The proposal also requires detailed records to be kept of

¹ P5_TA-PROV(2002) 614.

² OJ L 355, 5.12.1992, pp. 32-36.

animal movements, including the individual tag numbers. Member States may derogate from this with batch-recording of animals slaughtered before six months of age.

The proposal requires the competent authorities to set up a computer database which would record details of keepers, holdings and the number of sheep or goats they keep, and, by 1 July 2005, details of animal movements, but not down to the individual ID level.

Furthermore, the proposal envisages the introduction of electronic tagging (EID) by 1 July 2006. The Commission funded a long-term study into the feasibility of EID from 1998-2002¹. The study concluded that the technology was sufficiently developed to be implemented across the sheep industry.

The rapporteur's position

The main difficulty with the proposal is that it envisages the introduction of obligatory individual movement recording before the introduction of EID. The implementation of a paper-based traceability system at individual animal level is likely to be costly and time-consuming, particularly in those Member States where there are high volumes of movements of sheep and goats. For example, studies following the foot-and-mouth outbreak in the UK have shown that sheep undertake multiple movements, involving up to eight journeys through dealers and markets, between farm of origin and finishing farm. In the three weeks that it took to identify the farm where the outbreak originated, two million sheep had been moved around the country². This was in February and March, not during the peak period for sheep movements in the early autumn.

At peak times, therefore, the proposal might require the recording and processing of several million records each week in the UK alone.

Although farmers are required to record individual animal identification numbers each time animals are moved, there is no provision for them to be recorded on the central computer database. This increases the administrative burden on the farming industry, without delivering the rapid traceability which is needed to prevent the spread of disease and is, ultimately, the objective of the proposal.

Your rapporteur believes that the computer database referred to in Article 8 of the proposal should be established as soon as possible after the Regulation comes into force. The database should replace the central (paper-based) register of holdings in each Member State. Establishing the computer database would reduce the administrative burdens for keepers and other persons involved in the processing of records.

Your rapporteur believes that it is more important to know where and when animals have moved than to be able to determine the identity of each animal that moved. In a situation where animals from one holding develop a highly infectious disease such as FMD, it would

¹ European Commission (2003) IDEA project: Identification Electronique des Animaux, Final Report.

² Curry, D (2002), Farming and food: a sustainable future, Report of the Policy Commission on the Future of farming and Food, London, UK; Bourlakis, M & Allison J (2002) The Aftermath of the foot and mouth crisis in agricultural logistics: The case of the UK fat lamb chain, Centre of Rural Economy, University of Newcastle-Upon-Tyne, Newcastle, UK

be assumed that all animals from that holding could be infected with the disease, and all animals which had mixed with animals from that holding would be classified as potentially dangerous contacts. Therefore, in the event of a disease outbreak, all the animals from that holding would need to be traced. It is possible to trace all these animals, and all the potentially dangerous contacts, using a batch-recording system. Accordingly, your rapporteur believes that the recording of individual animal movements should be made compulsory only when a system has been developed which is demonstrably cost-effective and which takes account of the practicalities of the industry.

Accordingly, your rapporteur finds that the Member States should be allowed to choose between a batch-recording system and individual identification of animal movements. Factors which will influence the choice include:

- the number of sheep and goats
- specialist breeds or markets
- the value of the animal
- cost of implementation.

Both the individual and the batch traceability systems may operate in parallel.

In time, the ideal solution for ensuring traceability for the industry could be provided by EID. Movement documents could be generated automatically by farmers scanning their stock, and records could be provided to the competent authority in a form compatible with their database. However, EID is not a panacea. There are problems with cost, as well as with ensuring the cross-compatibility of electronic systems. The Commission has failed to produce any analysis concerning the cost of implementing the EID. Figures produced by the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) indicate that implementing the Commission proposal in the UK would cost an extra €125 million per year to industry and government until electronic tagging was introduced. EID would require an initial investment of around €60 million, with an annual running cost of an extra €62 million over the current system¹. This said, DEFRA estimates suggest that, once established, EID would be considerably cheaper than the double tagging system which the proposal requires.

While EID is being introduced the alternative recording system set out in the proposal should remain an option. Accordingly, the introduction of EID should be voluntary, at least until such time as enough experience in the practicalities of operating the system has been acquired. Moreover, the system for EID should conform to Community-wide minimum standards. Even after EID has been successfully introduced, paper-based record keeping should remain an option for smaller farmers, for whom the costs of implementing EID would be prohibitive.

Traceability is necessary to fight a disease outbreak once it has occurred. However, the root cause of the rapid spread of infectious animal diseases lies in the increased volume, distance and frequency of animal movements in the modern livestock industry. If this proposal is implemented effectively, it will provide a tool to help limit the spread of disease once an outbreak has occurred, although this must be coupled with effective measures to stop animal

¹ DEFRA (2002) Regulatory Impact Assessment on EU proposals for a Council Regulation establishing a system for the identification and registration of ovine and caprine animals and amending Regulation (EEC) No 3508/92.

movements. Over the longer term, the structural issues which have led to increased animal movements, such as closure of abattoirs, should be addressed.