

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

1.2.2006

FINAL  
A6—0017/2006

\*

## REPORT

on the proposal for a Council directive laying down minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production  
(COM(2005)0221 – C6-0190/2005 – 2005/0099(CNS))

Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

Rapporteur: Thijs Berman

### ***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). Suggested corrections of this kind are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION.....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	26
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY .....	29
PROCEDURE.....	44



## DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

**on the proposal for a Council directive laying down minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production  
(COM(2005)0221 – C6-0190/2005 – 2005/0099(CNS))**

**(Consultation procedure)**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2005)0221)<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to Article 37 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C6-0190/2005),
  - having regard to Rule 51 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development and the opinion of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (A6-0017/2006),
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.

\_\_\_\_\_ Text proposed by the Commission

\_\_\_\_\_ Amendments by Parliament

Amendment 1  
Recital 1 a (new)

***(1a) Goal prescriptions should be used to reach a high level of animal welfare. The scoring system for mortality and foot pad lesions indicates whether a good level of***

\_\_\_\_\_ <sup>1</sup> OJ C ... / Not yet published in OJ.

***animal welfare is reached. Other appropriate indicators are currently being developed through scientific research and should be included once available.***

*Justification*

*Goal prescriptions should be used to reach a good level of animal welfare in stead of means prescriptions. A maximum stocking density does not guarantee a high level of animal welfare. Low stocking density but bad management can lead to a lower level of animal welfare than a high stocking density but good management. Mortality and foot pad lesions should be used as indicators for animal welfare. Once more welfare indicators are identified they can be included.*

Amendment 2

Recital 9

(9) It is important that persons attending to chickens have an understanding of the relevant animal welfare requirements and receive appropriate training to perform their tasks.

(9) It is important that persons attending to chickens have an understanding of the relevant animal welfare requirements and receive appropriate training to perform their tasks. ***Where such persons lack formal training, the competent authorities should determine whether their professional experience is sufficient.***

*Justification*

*Due respect should be shown for the professional skills acquired by farmers, and these skills should be deemed at least equivalent to formal training.*

Amendment 3

Recital 10

(10) In establishing rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production, a balance should be kept between the various aspects to be taken into consideration, as regards animal welfare and health, economic and social considerations and the environmental impact.

(10) In establishing rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production, a balance should be kept between the various aspects to be taken into consideration, as regards animal welfare and health, economic and social considerations and the environmental impact. ***Notwithstanding the above, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, economic and social considerations should not take precedence over animal***

**welfare and health.**

*Justification*

*It needs to be emphasised that animal welfare and health are to be placed on an equal footing with economic and social interests when rules governing meat production are drawn up.*

Amendment 4  
Recital 12

(12) Various voluntary schemes already exist in different Member States for the labelling of chicken meat based on compliance with animal welfare standards and other parameters.

(12) Various voluntary schemes already exist in different Member States for the labelling of chicken meat based on compliance with animal welfare standards and other parameters. ***Such schemes should be strongly encouraged by producers' organisations, the competent authorities in the Member States and the Commission, because they meet a growing demand from consumers. The clarity of the information provided enables a responsible choice to be made at the time of purchase, which is in the interests of farmers, consumers and animals.***

Amendment 5  
Recital 13

(13) In light of the experience gained in applying such voluntary labelling schemes, it is appropriate for the Commission to submit a report on the possible introduction of a specific harmonised mandatory labelling regime at Community level for chicken meat, meat products and preparations based on compliance with animal welfare standards, including the possible socio-economic implications, the effects on the Community's economic partners and compliance of such a labelling regime with World Trade Organization rules.

(13) In light of the experience gained in applying such voluntary labelling schemes, it is appropriate for the Commission to submit, ***no later than six months after the entry into force of this Directive***, a report on the possible introduction of a specific harmonised mandatory labelling regime at Community level for chicken meat, meat products and preparations based on compliance with animal welfare standards, including the possible socio-economic implications, the effects on the Community's economic partners and compliance of such a labelling regime with World Trade Organization rules.

*Justification*

*The Commission should publish this report as soon as possible, given that labelling will draw attention to the efforts made by producers and thus help to give Community products greater added value in relation to imports from third countries.*

Amendment 6

Recital 14

(14) It is appropriate for the Commission to submit a report based on new scientific evidence taking into account further research and practical experience in order to improve further the welfare of chickens kept for meat production including the parent stock of such chickens, in particular as regards aspects not covered by this Directive. That report should specifically consider the influence of genetic parameters on identified deficiencies resulting in poor welfare of chickens kept for meat production.

(14) It is appropriate for the Commission to submit a report based on new scientific evidence taking into account further research and practical experience in order to improve further the welfare of chickens kept for meat production including the parent stock of such chickens, in particular as regards aspects not covered by this Directive. That report should specifically consider the influence of genetic parameters on identified deficiencies resulting in poor welfare of chickens kept for meat production. ***The report should also consider the financial cost arising from the removal of the negative impact of genetic parameters.***

*Justification*

*It is essential to take account of the financial impact of introducing or removing new data requirements for the protection of chickens kept for meat production.*

Amendment 7

Recital 14 a (new)

***(14a) The development of new techniques for measuring the welfare of chickens kept for meat production should be monitored and their usefulness should be assessed with a view to laying down clear parameters to be taken into account and to minimising the cost of the measures taken.***



Amendment 8

Recital 15

(15) Member States should lay down rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the provisions of this Directive and ensure that they are implemented. Those penalties must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive

(15) Member States should lay down **harmonised** rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the provisions of this Directive and **should** ensure that they are implemented. Those penalties must be effective, proportionate, **progressive** and dissuasive. **The EU should also control and, where necessary, prohibit imports of chickens from third countries which come from holdings which do not observe similar rules on the welfare of chickens for meat production as those to be adopted by the EU.**

*Justification*

*Penalties should be harmonised in order to guard against distortions of competition.*

*Imposing rules on the welfare of chickens on holdings in the EU increases the cost of production significantly and Community production will face unequal competition from chickens imported from third countries since such rules do not apply there.*

Amendment 9

Recital 15 a (new)

**(15a) The Commission should vigorously defend the importance of animal welfare during negotiations within the World Trade Organisation (WTO), with a view to securing a world-wide consensus on the matter. A high standard of animal welfare is essential to sustainable farming, and respect for animal welfare should be an established criterion in negotiations on non-trade concerns (NTCs).**

*Justification*

*Greater importance should be accorded to animal welfare within the World Trade Organisation.*

Amendment 10  
Recital 15 b (new)

***(15b) The Commission should endeavour to establish a rule under which exporters supplying poultrymeat to the European market must meet the same animal welfare requirements as EU chicken breeders.***

*Justification*

*On both humanitarian and economic grounds, producers exporting to the Union should be required to comply with meat production standards in the same way as Community producers are.*

Amendment 11  
Article 3, paragraph 1

1. The Member States shall ensure that the owner or keeper complies with the requirements set out in Annex I.

1. The Member States shall ensure that the owner or keeper complies with the requirements set out in Annex I. ***In assessing compliance with these requirements by both low-density and high-density establishments, account shall be taken of the various stages of production, on the one hand, and the various climatic conditions and the methods of keeping chickens used, on the other.***

Amendment 12  
Article 3, paragraph 2

2. The Member States shall ensure that the stocking density of chickens per square metre of useable area ('stocking density') in establishments or single units of an establishment does not exceed 30 kilogrammes liveweight.

2. The Member States shall ensure that the stocking density of chickens per square metre of useable area ('stocking density') in establishments or single units of an establishment does not exceed 30 kilogrammes liveweight. ***The maximum stocking density shall be measured as an average of the last three flocks. Two days' extension shall be permitted in the event of an emergency. However, the stocking density for any one flock shall never exceed 32 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.***

### *Justification*

*If the stocking density is measured as an average of three flocks, allowance can be made for minor variations in the weight of the chickens brought about by factors outside the farmer's control, such as delayed slaughter.*

*In certain cases it must be possible to keep stock on the farm for 2 days longer. These cases include, for example, slaughterhouse planning or food safety reasons.*

### Amendment 13

#### Article 3, paragraph 3, subparagraph 1

3. By way of derogation from paragraph 2, the Member States may provide that chickens be kept at a stocking density not exceeding 38 kilogrammes liveweight in establishments or single units of an establishment provided that the owner or keeper complies with the requirements set out in Annex II, in addition to the requirements set out in Annex I.

3. By way of derogation from paragraph 2, the Member States may provide that chickens be kept at a stocking density not exceeding 38 kilogrammes liveweight in establishments or single units of an establishment provided that the owner or keeper complies with the requirements set out in Annex II, in addition to the requirements set out in Annex I. ***The maximum stocking density shall be measured as an average of the last three flocks. Two days' extension shall be permitted if necessary. However, the stocking density for any one flock shall never exceed 40 kilogrammes per square metre.***

***From 1 January 2013 onwards the stocking density may not exceed 34 kilogrammes liveweight. This maximum stocking density shall be measured as an average of the last three flocks. Two days' extension shall be permitted if necessary. However, the stocking density for any one flock shall never exceed 36 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.***

### *Justification*

*A farmer needs to have the possibility to amortise his or her investments. However after 1 January 2013 a lower stocking density of 34 kg/m<sup>2</sup> is recommendable.*

*In certain cases it must be possible to keep stock on the farm for 2 days longer. These cases include, for example, slaughterhouse planning or food safety reasons.*

Amendment 14

Article 3, paragraph 3, subparagraph 2, introductory sentence

***In such cases of derogation, the Member State shall ensure that:***

***It is justified to extend monitoring to all establishments falling within the scope of the directive. The welfare of broilers needs to be monitored even on establishments where lower stocking densities are maintained, because stocking density alone does not guarantee animal welfare, which is also affected by many other factors. It should therefore be ensured that:***

Amendment 15

Article 3, paragraph 3, subparagraph 2, point (b a) (new)

***(ba) and the costs of the official inspections shall be borne by the competent authority itself.***

*Justification*

*The costs of the authorities must be covered in a uniform way.*

Amendment 16

Article 4, paragraph 3

3. Member States shall ensure that a system is established for the control and approval of training courses. The owner or keeper of the chickens shall hold a certificate which is recognised by the competent authority of the Member State, ***attesting to the completion of such training courses or having acquired experience equivalent to such training.***

3. Member States shall ensure that a system is established for the control and approval of training courses. The owner or keeper of the chickens shall hold a certificate which is recognised by the competent authority of the Member State, ***certifying the competence of the certificate holder to be satisfactory with respect to the subject areas detailed in Annex V.***

*Justification*

*Regular inspection of establishments by the competent animal welfare inspection authorities would place a considerable burden on farms and greatly increase the size of the authorities. It would also substantially increase costs. These can be curbed by having irregular inspections carried out on a random basis.*

Amendment 17  
Article 5, paragraph 1

Not later than **two years** from the date of adoption of this Directive, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and to the Council a report on the possible introduction of a specific harmonised mandatory labelling regime at Community level for chicken meat, meat products and preparations based on compliance with animal welfare standards.

Not later than **six months** from the date of adoption of this Directive, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and to the Council a report on the possible introduction of a specific harmonised mandatory labelling regime at Community level for chicken meat, meat products and preparations based on compliance with animal welfare standards, **including clear information concerning the production standards and the origin of the product. Labels shall, in particular, indicate the chicken stocking density at the holding concerned. Labels should also specify the animal's age and other parameters which consumers wish to be taken into account.**

*Justification*

*The Commission should publish this report as soon as possible, given that labelling will draw attention to the efforts made by producers and thus help to give Community products greater added value in relation to imports from third countries.*

*Labelling of the production standards and of the geographical origin of food products, especially meat products, is necessary for informed consumer choice. It is important that consumer behaviour, requirements and information are among the priorities in each new proposal in the chicken-keeping sector.*

Amendment 18  
Article 6, paragraph 1, subparagraph 1

1. Not later than **five** years from the date of adoption of this Directive, Member States shall submit to the Commission a summary of the data collected as provided for in points 1 and 2 of Annex IV.

1. Not later than **two** years from the date of adoption of this Directive, Member States shall submit to the Commission a summary of the data collected as provided for in points 1 and 2 of Annex IV.

Amendment 19  
Article 6, paragraph 1, subparagraph 2

Based on that data and on a scientific opinion of the European Food Safety Authority, the Commission shall submit to

Based on that data and on a scientific opinion of the European Food Safety Authority, **and not later than four years**

the European Parliament and to the Council a report concerning the influence of genetic parameters on identified deficiencies resulting in poor welfare of chickens. That report shall be accompanied by appropriate legislative proposals, if necessary.

*from the date of adoption of this Directive*, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and to the Council a report concerning the influence of genetic parameters on identified deficiencies **and all aspects of health** resulting in poor welfare of chickens. That report shall be accompanied by appropriate legislative proposals, if necessary.

***Such proposals shall be in keeping with the principle that genetic selection must not restrict, diminish or threaten animals' welfare potential. The adverse effects of earlier genetic selections must also be eliminated.***

#### *Justification*

*The amendment sets a deadline for the Commission to submit a report and legislative proposals.*

*Although genetic selection should not have an adverse impact on the welfare of chickens, scientific research has in the past produced negative effects of this kind.*

#### Amendment 20

Article 6, paragraph 1, subparagraph 2 a (new)

***The report and legislative proposals shall consider both the genetics of broilers and the welfare conditions under which parent stock are raised, and shall consider options such as farming birds of recognised slow-growing strains, restrictions on weight gain of birds per day, a minimum age for slaughter or prohibition of the use of broilers that derive from parent stock that have to be restrictively fed.***

#### *Justification*

*It has been clear for a long time that genetic parameters play a very important role in the welfare problems of broilers.*

Amendment 21  
Article 6, paragraph 2 a (new)

***2a. Two years after the entry into force of this Directive, the Commission shall conduct an assessment of the Directive's impact on the welfare of chickens kept for meat production and of its economic impact in each Member State.***

*Justification*

*The directive's impact on two essential factors, namely animal welfare and the economic situation of farmers, needs to be assessed.*

Amendment 22  
Article 6, paragraph 2 b (new)

***2b. Five years after the entry into force of this Directive, the Commission shall submit an assessment report covering the optimisation of the choice of the welfare parameters for chickens kept for meat production and appropriate welfare measurement techniques, with particular reference to behavioural parameters and parameters concerning metabolic disorders and skeletal disorders. The implementing method and the cost of welfare measurement techniques shall be covered by this assessment, in the interests of farmers and consumers.***

***No more than six months after its publication, this assessment shall, where appropriate, be followed by proposals for adjustments to the annexes of this Directive.***

*Justification*

*Progress in techniques used for measuring the welfare of chickens kept for meat production needs to be assessed, as do the potential benefits of future innovations in this area, in order to be able to lay down clear parameters to be taken into account and to keep the cost of the measures to a minimum.*

## Amendment 23

### Article 7

The Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the national provisions adopted pursuant to this Directive and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The penalties provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. The Member States shall notify those provisions to the Commission by [1 December 2006] at the latest and shall notify it without delay of any subsequent amendment affecting them.

The Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the national provisions adopted pursuant to this Directive and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The penalties provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. ***Except in clear cases of abandonment or mistreatment, which require immediate action, the penalties shall be gradual.*** The Member States shall notify those provisions to the Commission by [1 December 2006] at the latest and shall notify it without delay of any subsequent amendment affecting them.

### *Justification*

*Penalties must not jeopardise the continued existence of the holding. They must therefore be gradual, so as to enable the farmer to take the necessary steps to make good the shortcomings identified.*

## Amendment 24

### Annex I, point 2

2. Feed shall be continuously available and must not be withdrawn from chickens more than 12 hours before the expected slaughter time.

2. ***Chickens shall be fed daily, or*** feed shall be continuously available and must not be withdrawn from chickens more than 12 hours before the expected slaughter time.

### *Justification*

*Merely regular feeding would mean that chickens would only have to be fed, say, every two or three days.*

## Amendment 25

### Annex I, point 4

Ventilation ***and*** heating

4. ***Ventilation shall be sufficient to avoid***

Ventilation, heating ***and cooling systems***

4. ***The ventilation and heating***



*overheating and, where necessary in combination with heating systems, to remove moisture.*

*requirements shall take account of the stage of production, the climatic conditions and the methods of keeping chickens used.*

*The owner or keeper shall ensure that each unit of an establishment is equipped with ventilation, heating and cooling systems designed, constructed and operated in such a way that:*

*(a) the concentration of NH<sub>3</sub> does not exceed 20 ppm and the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> does not exceed 3000 ppm measured at the level of the chickens' heads;*

*(b) ventilation is sufficient to avoid overheating and, where necessary in combination with heating systems, to remove moisture;*

*(c) the inside temperature, when the outside temperature measured in the shade exceeds 30° C, does not exceed this outside temperature by more than 3° C;*

*(d) when the outside temperature is below 10° C, the relative humidity inside the unit of the establishment does not exceed 70%.*

*The ventilation, heating and cooling system shall be inspected at the intervals indicated in the documentation required under point 2 (c) of Annex II.*

#### *Justification*

*The requirements with which keepers should comply are a combination of many factors and should be taken into account.*

*The same quality criteria as regards NH<sub>3</sub> and CO<sub>2</sub> concentration levels and temperature control should apply to farm buildings in which the stocking density is less than 38 kg/m<sup>2</sup>.*

#### Amendment 26 Annex I, point 6

6. All buildings shall have light with an intensity of at least **20 lux** during the light periods, measured at bird eye level and illuminating the whole of the floor area. A

6. All buildings shall have **non-flickering** light with an intensity of at least **50 lux** during the light periods, measured at bird eye level and illuminating the whole of the

temporary reduction of the light level may be allowed when necessary following veterinary advice.

floor area. A temporary reduction of the light level may be allowed when necessary following veterinary advice.

*Justification*

*Non-flickering light of sufficient strength is particularly important to chickens, as they react in a very sensitive way to poor lighting conditions.*

Amendment 27  
Annex I, point 7

7. Within **three** days from the time when the chickens are placed in the building and until three days before the foreseen time of slaughter, the light must follow a 24-hour rhythm and include periods of darkness lasting at least **8** hours in total, with at least one uninterrupted period of darkness of at least 4 hours.

7. Within **seven** days from the time when the chickens are placed in the building and until three days before the foreseen time of slaughter, the light must follow a 24-hour rhythm and include periods of darkness lasting at least **six** hours in total, with at least one uninterrupted period of darkness of at least 4 hours.

*Justification*

*All available scientific data indicate that these periods are the most suitable.*

Amendment 28  
Annexe I, point 8

8. All chickens kept on the establishment must be inspected at least twice a day. ***The keeper shall establish a procedure which ensures that the inspecting person passes all chickens within a distance of not more than three metres.***

8. All chickens kept on the establishment must be inspected at least twice a day, ***or, if the establishment is equipped with an advanced monitoring system (computerised camera monitoring) that takes into account a variety of behavioural and health related parameters, at least once a day. Special attention should be paid to symptoms indicating a reduced level of animal welfare (including animal health). A veterinary surgeon should be contacted whenever necessary.***

*Justification*

*The use of innovations in monitoring systems, which are less and less expensive, should be incorporated in the directive as much as possible and thereby seek the possibility to minimise human presence, health risks, and stress.*

*Furthermore, requiring all chickens to be inspected from a distance of no more than three metres is impracticable. Chickens move. So there is no way of ensuring that they are inspected from a distance of no more than three metres.*

Amendment 29  
Annex I, point 9 a (new)

***9a. The competent authority shall carry out an inspection at least once a year.***

*Justification*

*Inspections should apply to all establishments, not only those with higher stocking densities.*

Amendment 30  
Annex I, point 11, point (b)

(b) the origin of the chickens;

(b) the origin ***and species*** of the chickens;

*Justification*

*The species of the chickens is one of the factors that need to be taken into account in order to enable a comprehensive assessment to be made and the welfare of the chickens to be monitored.*

Amendment 31  
Annex I, point 12, paragraph 2

***However, in order to prevent feather pecking and cannibalism, the Member States may authorise beak trimming provided it is carried out by qualified staff on chickens that are less than 10 days old. In addition, Member States may authorise the castration of male chickens. The castration shall only be carried out under veterinary supervision by personnel who have received a specific training*** ~~*deleted*~~

*authorised by the competent authority.*

*Justification*

*Reduction of the stocking density and the other measures suggested should prevent feather picking and cannibalism.*

Amendment 32  
Annex II, point 3

*Requirements for the establishments and the personnel*                      *deleted*

*3. The owner or keeper shall ensure that each unit of an establishment is equipped with ventilation, heating and cooling systems designed, constructed and operated in such a way that*

*(a) the concentration of NH<sub>3</sub> does not exceed 20 ppm and the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> does not exceed 3000 ppm measured at the level of the chickens' heads;*

*(b) the inside temperature, when the outside temperature measured in the shade exceeds 30° C, does not exceed this outside temperature by more than 3° C;*

*(c) when the outside temperature is below 10° C, the relative humidity inside the unit of the establishment does not exceed 70 %.*

*The ventilation, heating and cooling system shall be inspected at the intervals indicated in the documentation required under point 2 (c).*

Amendment 33  
Annex III, point 1, introductory part

1. The competent authority shall carry out *inspections* to verify:

1. The competent authority shall, *in the form of unannounced spot checks*, carry out *at least one yearly inspection in all broiler establishments (lower and higher stocking density)*, to verify:

## *Justification*

*Regular inspection of establishments by the competent animal welfare inspection authorities would place a considerable burden on farms and greatly increase the size of the authorities. It would also substantially increase costs. These can be curbed by having irregular inspections carried out on a random basis.*

### Amendment 34 Annex III, point 2

Following either an inspection in accordance with point 1 of this Annex, when such inspection finds out that the requirements set out in Annex II are not complied with or following a notification in accordance with point 3 of Annex IV, the competent authority may require the owner or keeper to eliminate factors prevailing in the establishment which are likely to have contributed to the deficiencies reported. In such a case the owner or keeper shall submit an action plan, endorsed by the veterinarian attending the establishment.

***In addition, the competent authority may order the reduction of the maximum stocking density for the establishment or units of establishments concerned to an extent adequate to correct the deficiency, normally to a stocking density of between 30 and 38 kilogrammes liveweight, when an inspection finds that the requirements set out in Annex II are not complied with or when receiving a notification under point 3 of Annex IV indicating a severe deficiency or a second notification of a deficiency previously notified for the same establishment. The competent authority shall inform the owner or keeper of the decision taken, and in particular of the moment from when the reduction in stocking densities shall take effect.***

Following either an inspection in accordance with point 1 of this Annex, when such inspection finds out that the requirements set out in Annex II are not complied with or following a notification in accordance with point 3 of Annex IV, the competent authority may require the owner or keeper to eliminate factors prevailing in the establishment which are likely to have contributed to the deficiencies reported. In such a case the owner or keeper shall submit an action plan, endorsed by the veterinarian attending the establishment.

The competent authority may, ***however***, order the reduction of the maximum stocking density for the establishment or units of establishments concerned to an extent adequate to correct the deficiency. ***The scale of such reductions shall be based on the average mortality rate and foot pad dermatitis score for three successive flocks, in accordance with Annex IV, points 3 and 4. Incidences of deficiencies in a flock shall be categorised into three groups:***

***- Group 1: no deficiencies or a small number of deficiencies (from 0 to one third of the scale established on the basis of Annex IV, points 3 and 4). In such***

*cases, no requirements other than that laid down in paragraph 1 of this point shall apply;*

*Group 2: a moderate number of deficiencies (from one third to two thirds of the scale established on the basis of Annex IV, points 3 and 4). If, following the detection of deficiencies in a flock, there are no improvements resulting in a return to Group 1 status, the farmer shall be notified of the obligation to reduce the maximum stocking density for the next flock by one kg/m<sup>2</sup>. The reduced density shall remain in force until such time as the holding's score returns to the level provided for under Group 1;*

*- Group 3: a large number of deficiencies (from two thirds to the top of the scale established on the basis of Annex IV, points 3 and 4). Following the detection of deficiencies in a flock, the farmer shall be notified of the obligation to reduce the maximum stocking density for the flock by one kg/m<sup>2</sup>.*

*If the farmer does not follow the procedure laid down in Annex III, point 3, a new examination shall be carried out between the 90th and 120th days following the date on which the reduction provided for in the previous paragraph was implemented. If the situation has not improved, a further reduction of one kg/m<sup>2</sup> shall be made. The same procedure shall be repeated until the holding's score returns to the level laid down for Group 1.*

*The competent authority shall inform the owner or keeper of the decision taken and in particular of the time from which the reduction of the stocking density shall take effect.*

However, the competent authority may decide that the stocking density shall not be reduced when the owner or keeper provides sufficient explanation for the exceptional nature of the deficiency or shows that the causes lie beyond their

However, the competent authority may decide that the stocking density shall not be reduced when the owner or keeper provides sufficient explanation for the exceptional nature of the deficiency or shows that the causes lie beyond their

sphere of control. In such a case the owner or keeper shall demonstrate that the relevant persons, such as the hatchery operator or the feed stuff supplier, have been informed of the occurrence of the deficiency in order to prevent its recurrence.

sphere of control. In such a case the owner or keeper shall demonstrate that the relevant persons, such as the hatchery operator or the feed stuff supplier, have been informed of the occurrence of the deficiency in order to prevent its recurrence.

#### *Justification*

*This is a clarification. Penalties must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive. Also differences between Member States should be avoided. A penalty of one kilogramme per square metre, as applied effectively in Sweden, has proved its effectiveness and is already sufficiently harsh as it takes away the profit margin. The penalty is applied on an average of three flocks but is suspended after a single flock has met the requirements of the annexes. The intention is to encourage farmers to maintain a high level of management, rather than penalising them excessively for a long period.*

#### Amendment 35 Annex III, point 3

3. The owner or keeper of the establishment **may request a revision of** the order of reduction of the maximum stocking densities as referred to in point 2 provided that

(a) the **two** previous **flocks** complied with the limits set out in point 3 of Annex IV; and

(b) the veterinarian attending the establishment has given a favourable opinion on the request.

***The competent authority shall decide on the request on the basis of an inspection of the establishment, including an evaluation of the documentation provided in accordance with points 1 and 2 of Annex II.***

3. ***At the request of*** the owner or keeper of the establishment, the order of reduction of the maximum stocking densities as referred to in point 2 ***shall be lifted totally and immediately by the competent authority*** provided that

(a) the previous **flock** complied with the limits set out in point 3 of Annex IV; and

(b) the veterinarian attending the establishment has given a favourable opinion on the request.

#### *Justification*

*Removing the penalties swiftly once the scores have returned to within the limits laid down in Annex IV, point 3 will encourage farmers to work to maintain proper standards at their farms without penalising them unnecessarily.*

*The penalties should be removed automatically as soon as the establishment complies once again with the limits laid down in Annex IV, point 3.*

Amendment 36  
Annex IV, point 1, subparagraph 1

1. At the slaughterhouse each consignment shall undergo under the supervision of the official veterinarian an inspection of a representative sample of **at least 200** chickens concerning the occurrence of foot pad dermatitis, establishing a scoring in accordance with point 4.

1. At the slaughterhouse each consignment shall undergo under the supervision of the official veterinarian an inspection of a representative sample of **100** chickens concerning the occurrence of foot pad dermatitis, establishing a scoring in accordance with point 4.

*Justification*

*The inspection requirements should not be unnecessarily complicated.*

Amendment 37  
Annexe IV, point 4, paragraph 2 a (new)

***Detailed written descriptions, added with photographs of lesions in groups 1 and 2 shall be laid down by the European Commission in order to obtain a uniform classification all over Europe.***

*Justification*

*To guarantee uniformity within the EU, the detailed rules for a scoring system must be introduced by writing down proper descriptions with photographs as examples of 'typical' lesions for the different levels, in order to standardise the classifications all over Europe.*

Amendment 38  
Annex IV, point 4, paragraph 2 b (new)

***A transitional period of at least two years shall be granted for the implementation of the evaluation and scoring system in respect of foot pad dermatitis.***



*Justification*

*The transitional period is considered necessary in order to train the veterinarians who are to carry out the inspections as, at present, there is no relevant experience and the conclusions to be drawn will be used as a basis for determining whether an establishment is in compliance with animal welfare criteria and for imposing penalties.*

Amendment 39  
Annex V, point (b)

(b) physiology, in particular drinking and feeding needs, animal behaviour and the concept of stress;

(b) physiology, in particular drinking and feeding needs, animal behaviour ***including signs of normal behaviour, abnormal behaviour and fear***, and the concept of stress;

*Justification*

*Keepers and owners should be aware when there are indications of poor welfare, and be capable of handling animals in a manner which minimises suffering.*

Amendment 40  
Annex V, point (c)

(c) the practical aspects of the handling of chickens, including catching and transport;

(c) the practical aspects of the ***compassionate*** handling of chickens, including catching and transport;

Amendment 41  
Annex V, point (d)

(d) emergency care for chickens, emergency killing and culling

(d) ***the recognition of signs of common diseases and the appropriate course of action***, emergency care for chickens, emergency killing and culling.

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

All good farmers respect their animals. This goes without saying, and, indeed, it is only by doing so that they are able to earn a living. Nonetheless, a legal framework is required in order to ensure respect for farm animals. This has been the opinion of a majority of EU citizens for some years now, and is a view that has been strengthened by the mad cow, foot and mouth and 'dioxin chickens' crises and by images of caged calves and battery chickens. While industrial farming means ever-cheaper food on our plates, it also carries with it a number of risks which need to be countered in order to ensure the health and welfare of animals.

The body of European legislation on animal welfare has been built up slowly over the past few decades. Under the Treaty of Rome an animal was seen as no more than an agricultural product. The first step was taken by the Council of Europe, which in 1976 adopted a Convention on the Protection of Farm Animals. Implementation of this convention was followed by recommendations on various species of animal, such as bovines, sheep and geese.

The convention formed the starting point for the series of directives issued by the Community, particularly Directive 98/58/EC, which is the framework directive on the protection of farm animals. The provisions of this directive are naturally extremely general in scope and contain few binding requirements, and the European Union has thus since fleshed out its legislation in this area with more specific texts covering calves, laying chickens, protection at slaughter, protection during transport, and so on.

The directive on the welfare of chickens kept for meat production forms part of this process.

### A response to public demand

The new legislative proposal is a response to increasing public concern about animal welfare. The place occupied by animals in our societies has changed. Despite the industrialisation of farming, animals are now seen as sentient beings which have a right to respect. This is a long-overdue victory for Aristotle, who believed that Man (sometimes) differed from animals in his ability to reason, but shared with them a capacity for movement and, above all, feeling.

Public interest in the origin and quality of products has steadily grown with each new epizootic crisis that has arisen. Robert Dantzer of the INRA (French Institute for Agronomic Research) points out that 'nowadays, animal products must not just meet a number of hygiene standards - i.e. must be fit for consumption - they must also have a number of organoleptic properties and at the same time - and this is what is really new - must have an ethical value'. In the latest Eurobarometer survey (2005), the respondents felt chickens and laying hens to be the two animals most in need of improved rearing conditions.

### Broiler chickens: a highly industrialised sector with no uniform rules

The figure for the slaughter of broiler chickens in the European Union - some five billion each year - is higher than that for the slaughter of any other farm animal. Productivity in this sector

has risen in a spectacular manner. Genetic selection in particular has led to a sharp increase in the rate of growth of chickens and, at the same time, a sharp decrease in the number of kilogrammes of feed required to produce each kilogramme of meat. As a result, slaughter ages have fallen considerably. Nonetheless, the mortality rate is excessively high on too many farms and large numbers of skin lesions are recorded.

As is pointed out in the March 2000 report of the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare, which forms the basis for the Commission proposal, the situation as regards broiler chickens varies considerably around the European Union, with major disparities in slaughter weight or age. The same is true for stocking densities which, again according to the report, vary from 22.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (11 chickens/m<sup>2</sup>) to 42.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup> (25.4 chickens/m<sup>2</sup>), with individual instances of more than 50 kg/m<sup>2</sup>. This situation is the result of both climatic conditions and the lack of uniform legislation covering the whole of the Union.

The Commission proposal has two aims, namely to improve the living conditions of broiler chickens on intensive farms and to put an end to the major regulatory disparities in the sector.

As things currently stand, the only provisions applying at Community level are the general requirements laid down in Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of farm animals.

### Criticisms of the Commission proposals

Producers in this sector have low margins. Changing over from the current stocking densities to those recommended by the Commission would lead to a loss of earnings in some Member States. In order to maintain the same margins, prices would need to be increased by a few cents. Professionals in the sector are concerned that, even if prices were to be raised in this way, a lower stocking density might result in the sector becoming marginalised on both Community and third-country markets.

A number of remarks may be made on this point. Maintaining or raising margins must not be achieved at the cost of a deterioration in chickens' living conditions but by reducing the disproportionate power that supermarkets exert over the setting of purchase prices.

It should be noted, furthermore, that in several Member States (particularly in the south, owing to climatic conditions), stocking densities comparable to, or even lower than, those proposed by the Commission are already in use.

Lastly, whatever the stocking density used, European producers will not in the long term be able to stand up to competition from countries such as Brazil on third-country markets, particularly in the frozen chicken sector. Would it therefore not be better for European producers to focus on quality and the fresh chicken market in Europe?

### Rapporteur's position

The Commission proposal is basically moving in the right direction. It identifies a few simple indicators (mortality and foot pad lesions) of the welfare of chickens kept for meat production. It then puts forward basic criteria for living conditions, to be monitored under a system that is already widely used.

The Commission proposes that further scientific research be conducted, for example into parent stocks and genetic selection. It also proposes to submit appropriate legislative proposals on such matters, if necessary. This seems the right way of going about things, since it was important not to lose any time in introducing the directive on chickens kept for meat production. However, the process needs to be speeded up. Furthermore, it is regrettable that the Commission failed to include requirements concerning genetic selection, which all scientists agree is a determining factor in animal welfare.

The rapporteur would like an inviolable principle to be established, namely that genetic selection must never restrict or diminish an animal's welfare potential.

On the matter of surgical interventions, the rapporteur considers that the proposal's provisions should be tightened up: all unnecessary and painful mutilations, such as beak trimming and castration, should be prohibited.

The Commission is also proposing to restrict the number of chickens per square metre. Densities of above 15 chickens/m<sup>2</sup> must be seen as overcrowding, although it is true that efficient management procedures can make this bearable. This proposal is therefore geared to quality and professionalism among Europe's farmers. The stocking density - no more than 30 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, with up to 38 kg/m<sup>2</sup> under specific conditions - is a compromise that can provide an acceptable standard of welfare. The additional cost is small, and in most countries farmers will have no problem meeting this requirement since they are in practice already doing so.

Farmers will be able to adjust to the new requirements on two conditions. First, the additional cost of a few cents will need to be passed on to consumers rather than coming out of farmers' earnings. All the surveys conducted recently indicate that European consumers are ready for this. Secondly, emphasis should be placed on labelling as a means of highlighting animal welfare standards, which are becoming an increasingly important selling point throughout the Union.

The Commission has decided to leave up to the Member States the choice of penalties for failure to comply with quality criteria. This arrangement entails a risk of disparities and market distortions arising, which would be damaging to both farmers and chickens and would leave consumers with uncertainties about the welfare of the animals. The rapporteur takes the view that what is required is a uniform system partly modelled on that in force in Sweden, which restricts the severity of the penalties and encourages good management.

The rapporteur would like the directive on the welfare of broiler chickens to be followed in the near future by other similar pieces of legislation. Directives of this kind will enable European agriculture to make further progress towards sustainability.

2.12.2005

**OPINION  
OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND FOOD  
SAFETY**

for the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

on the proposal for a Council directive laying down minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production  
(COM(2005)0221 – C6-0190/2005 – 2005/0099(CNS))

Draftsman: Dan Jørgensen

**SHORT JUSTIFICATION**

The farming of chickens for meat production is one of the most intensive farming systems with challenges for both the welfare and health of the chickens. This sector is not covered by specific Community legislation; only the general requirements of Directive 98/58/EC concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes apply. Consumers are also increasingly aware and concerned with standards of animal protection.

The Commission has therefore put forward a proposal for a directive laying down minimum requirements for the keeping of these chickens.

The proposal lays down requirements to be met by the establishments, dividing them into two categories:

1. Establishments with a stocking density of chickens of maximum 30kg per square metre live weight.
2. For establishments with a stocking density not exceeding 38kg per square metre live weight more extensive requirements are set out.

Training and guidance has to be provided for personnel at the establishments. The establishments are to be monitored and records are to be kept, with a procedure of non-compliance to be used if needed. Monitoring and follow-up will also take place at the slaughterhouse, with a scoring system for mortality and foot disease (foot pad dermatitis) on the controlled chickens.

Your draftsman welcomes the Commission proposal to deal with the welfare problems associated with chickens kept for meat production.

There are however three areas, where he would like to propose some changes: the stocking density of the chickens, the scoring system proposed and the issue of castration and beak trimming.

### **I. Stocking density**

Behaviour and leg disorder studies clearly show that high stocking density above 25kg per square metre, lead to serious welfare problems, as the restriction of movement causes foot pad dermatitis, leg problems, breast blisters, restriction of normal behaviour, and ultimately high mortality rates. The Scientific Committee on animal Health and Animal welfare conclude in its rapport from 2000, "The welfare of Chickens Kept for meet Production" on page 66:

It is clear from the behaviour and leg disorder studies that the stocking density must be 25 kg per square metre or lower for major welfare problems to be largely avoided and that above 30 kg per square metre, even with very good environmental control systems, there is a steep rise in the frequency of serious problems. .

Your draftsman therefore proposes for the stocking density to be reduced to 25 kg live weight per square metre. If the owner or the keeper complies with the requirements set out in the Annex II, the stocking density can be extended to 30 kg live weight per square metre.

### **II. Scoring system**

At slaughter samples from the feet of the chickens are taken and checked for the occurrence of foot pad dermatitis, establishing a scoring. If the score exceeds 50 points the official veterinary shall notify the owner or keeper of that establishment.

Foot pad dermatitis is a major welfare problem and should be avoided if at all possible. According to the experience from a couple of member states there is no need for the score to exceed 40 points. Your draftsman therefore proposes the acceptable score to be changed to 40 points.

### **III. Beak trimming**

The Proposal allows beak trimming. If the stocking density is reduced the problems motivating the trimming; feather pecking and cannibalism diminish automatically. The mutilation of all livestock is undesirable and beak trimming should be avoided if at all possible. However in some systems it may currently be necessary. Where the operation is performed correctly, it can help to avoid serious problems. Nevertheless, the ultimate aim should be the avoidance of beak trimming. The industry should be urged to seek a practicable and workable solution to the problem of feather pecking and cannibalism without the need for beak trimming.

## Conclusions

Good farm management and practices help improve the health and welfare of the animals as well as preventing diseases. Consumers are increasingly concerned with animal welfare issues, making improved welfare standards an important competitive advantage for the chicken industry. Farmers who put an effort into improving the welfare of chickens should be encouraged and not be disadvantaged by those who are negligent about animal welfare. The Proposed Directive is therefore an important step in raising the welfare standards for chickens for meat production in the Community as a whole.

## AMENDMENTS

The Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety calls on the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

<u>Text proposed by the Commission<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Amendments by Parliament</u>
<b>Amendment 1</b> Citation 1	
Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 37 thereof,	Having regard to the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 37 <b>and Article 152</b> thereof,
<i>Justification</i>	
<i>Increasing animal welfare for chickens by decreasing farming intensity and by using more resistant breeds reduces the need for using veterinary medicines, feed additives or biocides. The provisions of this directive should therefore also have a desirable impact on food safety and public health. Thus a double legal basis should be used.</i>	
<b>Amendment 2</b> Recital 10	
(10) In establishing rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production, a balance should be kept between the various aspects to be taken into consideration, as regards animal welfare and health, economic and social considerations and the	(10) In establishing rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production, a balance should be kept between the various aspects to be taken into consideration, as regards animal welfare and health, economic and social considerations and the

---

<sup>2</sup> Not yet published in OJ.

*environmental impact.*

*impacts on food safety and the environment.*

*Justification*

*Increasing animal welfare of chickens by decreasing farming intensity and by using more resistant breeds reduces the need for using veterinary medicines, feed additives or biocides. The provisions of this directive should therefore also have a desirable impact on food safety and public health.*

Amendment 3

Article 1, point (a)

(a) establishments *with less* than 100 chickens;

(a) establishments *normally having fewer* than 100 chickens;

*Justification*

*The number of chickens in an establishment may be temporarily less than 100 chickens at any given instant. Establishments which temporarily fall below 100 chickens should nevertheless remain within the scope of this Directive.*

Amendment 4

Article 1, point (b)

(b) establishments with breeding stocks of *deleted* chickens;

*Justification*

*Breeding stocks should be included in the scope of the directive.*

Amendment 5

Article 3, paragraph 2

2. The Member States shall ensure that the stocking density of chickens per square metre of useable area ('stocking density') in establishments or single units of an establishment does not exceed **30 kilogrammes** liveweight.

2. The Member States shall ensure that the stocking density of chickens per square metre of useable area ( 'stocking density ') in establishments or single units of an establishment does not exceed **25 kilogrammes** liveweight.



Amendment 6  
Article 3, paragraph 3, subparagraph 1

3. By way of derogation from paragraph 2, the Member States may provide that chickens be kept at a stocking density not exceeding **38 kilogrammes** liveweight in establishments or single units of an establishment provided that the owner or keeper complies with the requirements set out in Annex II, in addition to the requirements set out in Annex I.

3. By way of derogation from paragraph 2, the Member States may provide that chickens be kept at a stocking density not exceeding **30 kilogrammes** liveweight in establishments or single units of an establishment provided that the owner or keeper complies with the requirements set out in Annex II, in addition to the requirements set out in Annex I.

Amendment 7  
Article 4, paragraph 3

3. Member States shall ensure that a system is established for the control and approval of training courses. The owner or keeper of the chickens shall hold a certificate which is recognised by the competent authority of the Member State, attesting to the completion of such a training courses or having acquired experience equivalent to such training.

3. Member States shall ensure that a system is established for the control and approval of training courses, **including independent examination of the competence of the persons referred to in paragraph 1(a)**. The owner or keeper of the chickens shall hold a certificate which is recognised by the competent authority of the Member State, attesting to the completion of such a training courses or having acquired experience equivalent to such training.

*Justification*

*Training courses must result in measurable improvements in competence.*

Amendment 8  
Article 6, paragraph 1

1. Not later than **five** years from the date of adoption of this Directive, Member States shall submit to the Commission a summary of the data collected as provided for in points 1 and 2 of Annex IV.

Based **on that data and** on a scientific opinion of the European Food Safety Authority, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament and to the Council a report concerning the influence

1. Not later than **two** years from the date of adoption of this Directive, Member States shall submit to the Commission a summary of the data collected as provided for in points 1 and 2 of Annex IV.

Based on a scientific opinion of the European Food Safety Authority, **and not later than four years from the date of adoption of this Directive**, the Commission shall submit to the European Parliament

of genetic parameters on identified deficiencies resulting in poor welfare of chickens. That report shall be accompanied by appropriate legislative proposals, if necessary.

and to the Council a report concerning the influence of genetic parameters on identified deficiencies **and all aspects of health** resulting in poor welfare of chickens **in broiler and breeding holdings**. That report shall be accompanied by appropriate legislative proposals, if necessary. **The report and legislative proposals should consider improved housing as well as the genetics of broilers, the loss of genetic diversity in chicken breeding, and the welfare conditions under which parent stock are raised, including a cost-benefit analysis of the use of various breeding strains with regard to animal health, resistance to diseases and the necessary use of biocides and veterinary medicinal products, and should consider options such as farming birds of a recognised slow-growing strain, restrictions on weight gain of birds per day, a minimum age for slaughter or prohibition of the use of broilers that derive from parent stock that have to be restrictively fed.**

#### *Justification*

*Five years is far too long. Member States should be in a position within two years to submit to the Commission a summary of the data collected.*

*It has been clear for a long time that the generic parameters play a very important role in the welfare problems of broilers. Uniform selection of chicken breeds with a rapid growth performance is responsible for many of the welfare problems, animal diseases as well as food safety problems. This amendment sets tighter deadlines for the collection of data and sets a deadline for the Commission to submit a report and legislative proposals.*

#### Amendment 9 Article 6, paragraph 2

2. The format of the data to be submitted, as provided for in paragraph 1, shall be determined by the Commission within **two years** from the date of adoption of this Directive in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 9.

2. The format of the data to be submitted, as provided for in paragraph 1, shall be determined by the Commission within **one year** from the date of adoption of this Directive in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 9.

### *Justification*

*It has been clear for a long time that the generic parameters play a very important role in the welfare problems of broilers. This amendment sets tighter deadlines for the collection of data and sets a deadline for the Commission to submit a report and legislative proposals.*

#### Amendment 10 Annex I, point 2

2. Feed shall be continuously available and must not be withdrawn from chickens more than 12 hours before the expected slaughter time.

2. Feed shall be continuously available ***or be meal fed*** and must not be withdrawn from chickens more than 12 hours before the expected slaughter time.

### *Justification*

*The Directive requires feed to be continuously available, however, several scientific studies have illustrated that meal feeding can be equally beneficial and thus should also be acceptable according to this Directive.*

#### Amendment 11 Annex I, point 3

3. All chickens shall have permanent access to litter which is dry and friable on the surface.

3. All chickens shall have permanent access to litter which is dry and friable on the surface, ***hygienic, of a suitable material and particle size, and maintained at an average depth of at least 5 cm.***

***After a building is depopulated, all litter must be removed, the establishment appropriately sanitised (cleaned and disinfected) and new birds provided with clean litter.***

### *Justification*

*Litter should be at least 5cm deep and hygienic.*

*In order to prevent outbreaks of contagious diseases such as respiratory diseases, Avian Influenza and Newcastle disease, the level of biosecurity on broiler farms should be high. After a building is depopulated, it is important to remove litter and sanitise the establishment.*

Amendment 12  
Annex I, point 4

4. *Ventilation shall be sufficient to avoid overheating and, where necessary in combination with heating systems, to remove moisture.*

4. *The establishment shall be equipped with ventilation, heating and cooling systems. The owner or keeper shall ensure that each unit is designed, constructed and operated in such a way that:*

*(a) the concentration of NH<sub>3</sub> does not exceed 15 ppm and the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> does not exceed 3000 ppm measured at the level of the chickens' heads;*

*(b) the inside temperature, when the outside temperature measured in the shade exceeds 30° C, does not exceed that outside temperature by more than 3° C;*

*(c) when the outside temperature is below 10° C, the relative humidity inside the unit of the establishment does not exceed 70 %.*

*The ventilation, heating and cooling system shall be inspected.*

*Justification*

*Moisture, with high temperature, promotes bacterial growth which will decompose organic material and produce ammonia. Ammonia and wet litter combined are responsible for many problems such as contact dermatitis, infectious and respiratory diseases and ascites. To eliminate these problems, ammonia levels should be kept below 15ppm under all conditions.*

Amendment 13  
Annex I, point 6

6. All buildings shall have light with an intensity of at least **20 lux** during the light periods, **measured** at bird eye level and illuminating the whole of the floor area. A temporary reduction of the light level may be allowed when necessary following veterinary advice.

6. All buildings shall have light with an intensity of **an average of at least 50 lux** during the light periods **and never falling below 20 lux, such measurements to be** at bird eye level, and illuminating the whole of the floor area. **Only light sources with flicker-free frequencies shall be used.** A temporary reduction of the light level may be allowed when necessary following veterinary advice.

*Justification*

*Light intensity should not fall below 20 lux, but a higher level of an average of 50 lux should be required.*

*As chickens perceive artificial light sources differently and as flickering light can cause high levels of stress, this provision is necessary to increase animal welfare.*

Amendment 14  
Annex I, point 7

7. Within three days from the time when the chickens are placed in the building and until three days before the foreseen time of slaughter, the light must follow a 24-hour rhythm and include periods of darkness lasting at least 8 hours in total, with at least one uninterrupted period of darkness of at least **4 hours**.

7. Within three days from the time when the chickens are placed in the building and until three days before the foreseen time of slaughter, the light must follow a 24-hour rhythm and include periods of darkness lasting at least 8 hours in total, with at least one uninterrupted period of darkness of at least **6 hours**.

*Justification*

*Following the recommendation of the European Convention.*

Amendment 15  
Annex I, point 7 a (new)

***Environmental enrichment***

***7a. Environmental enrichment shall be provided (in the form of, for example, straw bales, brassicas or the scattering of whole grain).***

*Justification*

*Environmental enrichment is a low cost method to stimulate birds' activity, allowing them to meet some of their behavioural needs and leading to improved leg strength.*

Amendment 16  
Annex I, point 9 a (new)

***9a. The competent authority shall carry out an inspection at least once a year.***

*Justification*

*Inspections should apply to all establishments not only those with higher stocking densities.*

Amendment 17  
Annex I, point 10

10. Those parts of buildings, equipment or utensils which are in contact with the chickens shall be thoroughly cleaned and disinfected every time after depopulation is carried out, before a new flock is introduced into the unit.

10. Those parts of buildings, equipment or utensils which are in contact with the chickens shall be thoroughly cleaned and disinfected every time after depopulation is carried out, before a new flock is introduced into the unit. ***All in/all out systems with sanitation of the unit between consecutive groups are strongly recommended.***

*Justification*

*In order to prevent outbreaks of contagious diseases such as respiratory diseases, Avian Influenza and Newcastle disease, the level of biosecurity on broiler farms should be high. To enhance a thorough cleaning and disinfection of broiler houses, "all in all out" systems are recommended. Between each two consecutive groups of broilers, every site should be left for a number of days without broilers after the litter has been discarded and the house sanitised.*

Amendment 18  
Annex I, point 12, paragraph 2

***However, in order to prevent feather pecking and cannibalism, the Member States may authorise beak trimming provided it is carried out by qualified staff on chickens that are less than 10 days old. In addition, Member States may authorise the castration of male chickens. The castration shall only be carried out under veterinary supervision by personnel who have received a specific training authorised by the competent authority.***

***Beak trimming should only be allowed by Member States when all other measures to prevent feather pecking and cannibalism are exhausted, and only on the advice of a veterinarian and carried out by qualified staff on chickens that are less than 10 days old. The castration of male chickens shall be prohibited.***

*Justification*

*Beak trimming has already been banned in some countries and is being phased out in others. Before using this painful procedure, other measures to reduce feather pecking and cannibalism should be examined, such as environmental enrichment, nutritional and lighting*

*strategies or the use of fitted devices. There is no justification for the castration of male broilers from a veterinary or animal welfare perspective.*

#### Amendment 19

##### Annex II, point 1, subparagraph 1

1. The owner or keeper shall notify to the competent authority their intention to use a stocking density of more than **30 kilogrammes** liveweight.

1. The owner or keeper shall to notify to the competent authority their intention to use a stocking density of more than **25 kilogrammes** liveweight.

#### Amendment 20

##### Annex II, point 3, subparagraph 1

3. The owner or keeper shall ensure that each unit of an establishment is equipped with ventilation, heating and cooling systems designed, constructed and operated in such a way that

(a) the concentration of NH<sub>3</sub> does not exceed **20 ppm** and the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> does not exceed 3000 ppm measured at the level of the chickens' heads;

(b) the inside temperature, *when the outside temperature measured in the shade exceeds 30° C*, does not exceed *this outside temperature by more than 3° C*;

(c) *when the outside temperatures is below 10° C*, the relative humidity inside the unit of the establishment does not exceed 70 %.

3. The owner or keeper shall ensure that each unit of an establishment is equipped with ventilation, heating and cooling systems designed, constructed and operated in such a way that

(a) the concentration of NH<sub>3</sub> does not exceed **15 ppm** and the concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> does not exceed 3000 ppm measured at the level of the chickens' heads;

(b) the inside temperature does not exceed **35° C**;

(c) the relative humidity inside the unit of the establishment does not exceed 70 %.

#### *Justification*

*Appropriate ventilation and temperature regulation should be minimum requirements for all establishments. For those establishments making use of the derogation, higher standards should be met.*

#### Amendment 21

##### Annex III, point 1, introductory part

1. The competent authority shall carry out inspections to verify:

1. The competent authority shall carry out inspections **at least once a year** to verify:

Amendment 22  
Annex III, point 2

2. Following either an inspection in accordance with point 1 of this Annex, when such inspection finds out that the requirements set out in Annex II are not complied with or following a notification in accordance with point 3 of Annex IV, the competent authority may require the owner or keeper to eliminate factors prevailing in the establishment which are likely to have contributed to the deficiencies reported. In such a case the owner or keeper shall submit an action plan, endorsed by *the* veterinarian attending the establishment.

In addition, the competent authority may order the reduction of the maximum stocking density for the establishment or units of establishments concerned to an extent adequate to correct the deficiency, normally to a stocking density of between **30 and 38 kilogrammes** liveweight, when an inspection finds that the requirements set out in Annex II are not complied with or when receiving a notification under point 3 of Annex IV indicating a severe deficiency or a second notification of a deficiency previously notified for the same establishment. The competent authority shall inform the owner or keeper of the decision taken, and in particular of the moment from when the reduction in stocking densities shall take effect.

However, the competent authority may decide that the stocking density shall not be reduced when the owner or keeper provides sufficient explanation for the exceptional nature of the deficiency *or shows that the causes lie beyond their sphere of control*. In such a case the owner or keeper shall demonstrate that the relevant persons, such as the hatchery operator or the feed stuff supplier, have been informed of the occurrence of the deficiency in order to prevent its

2. Following either an inspection in accordance with point 1 of this Annex, when such inspection finds out that the requirements set out in Annex II are not complied with or following a notification in accordance with point 3 of Annex IV, the competent authority may require the owner or keeper to eliminate factors prevailing in the establishment which are likely to have contributed to the deficiencies reported. In such a case the owner or keeper shall submit an action plan, endorsed by *an official* veterinarian attending the establishment.

In addition, the competent authority may order the reduction of the maximum stocking density for the establishment or units of establishments concerned to an extent adequate to correct the deficiency, normally to a stocking density of between **25 and 30 kilogrammes** liveweight, when an inspection finds that the requirements set out in Annex II are not complied with or when receiving a notification under point 3 of Annex IV indicating a severe deficiency or a second notification of a deficiency previously notified for the same establishment. The competent authority shall inform the owner or keeper of the decision taken, and in particular of the moment from when the reduction in stocking densities shall take effect.

However, the competent authority may decide that the stocking density shall not be reduced when the owner or keeper provides sufficient explanation for the exceptional nature of the deficiency. In such a case the owner or keeper shall demonstrate that the relevant persons, such as the hatchery operator or the feed stuff supplier, have been informed of the occurrence of the deficiency in order to prevent its recurrence.



recurrence.

*Justification*

*The action plan to remedy deficiencies should be endorsed by an official veterinarian.*

*The reason for the competent authority to not reduce stocking density should be limited to exceptional circumstances that can be corrected.*

Amendment 23  
Annex III, point 3, point (b)

(b) *the* veterinarian attending the establishment has given a favourable opinion on the request.

(b) *an official* veterinarian attending the establishment has given a favourable opinion on the request.

*Justification*

*The request for a revision of a reduced maximum stocking density should involve the favourable opinion of an official veterinarian.*

Amendment 24  
Annex IV, point 1, subparagraph 1

1. At the slaughterhouse each consignment shall undergo under the supervision of the official veterinarian an inspection of a representative sample of at least 200 chickens concerning the occurrence of foot pad dermatitis, establishing a scoring in accordance with point 4.

1. At the slaughterhouse each consignment shall undergo under the supervision of the official veterinarian an inspection of a representative sample of at least 200 chickens concerning the occurrence of foot pad dermatitis *and breast blisters*, establishing a scoring in accordance with point 4.

*Justification*

*Breast blisters should be taken into account as clear indicators for bad animal welfare conditions.*

Amendment 25  
Annex IV, point 3, table 1, entry 1

Foot pad dermatitis **50 points**

Foot pad dermatitis **40 points**

Amendment 26  
Annex IV, point 4, subparagraph 1, Group 2

Group 2: severe foot pad lesions.

Group 2: severe food pad lesions *and/or breast blisters*.

Amendment 27  
Annex IV, point 4, subparagraph 2 a (new)

*Detailed descriptions and photographs of lesions in each group shall be set out by the Commission in order to standardise the classifications across the EU.*

*Justification*

*To ensure uniformity within the EU, the rules for the scoring system should be accompanied by detailed descriptions and photographs of examples of "minor" and "severe" foot pad lesions.*

Amendment 28  
Annex V, point (d)

(d) emergency care for chickens, emergency killing and culling.

(d) *the recognition of symptoms of disease, treatment and* emergency care for chickens, emergency killing and culling.

*Justification*

*Training should include recognition of common signs of disease.*

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production
<b>References</b>	COM(2005)0221 - C6-0190/2005 - 2005/0099(CNS)
<b>Committee responsible</b>	AGRI
<b>Opinion by</b> Date announced in plenary	ENVI 22.6.2005
<b>Drafts(wo)man</b> Date appointed	Dan Jørgensen 12.7.2005
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	11.10.2005      21.11.2005
<b>Date adopted</b>	28.11.2005
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+:            31 -:            4 0:            0
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Adamos Adamou, Georgs Andrejevs, Irena Belohorská, Johannes Blokland, John Bowis, Dorette Corbey, Chris Davies, Mojca Drčar Murko, Edite Estrela, Karl-Heinz Florenz, Matthias Groote, Françoise Grossetête, Satu Hassi, Gyula Hegyi, Mary Honeyball, Dan Jørgensen, Christa Kläß, Holger Kraemer, Linda McAvan, Péter Olajos, Vittorio Prodi, Dagmar Roth-Behrendt, Guido Sacconi, Carl Schlyter, Horst Schnellhardt, Jonas Sjöstedt, María Sornosa Martínez, Antonios Trakatellis, Evangelia Tzampazi, Thomas Ulmer, Anja Weisgerber, Åsa Westlund
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Margrete Auken, Caroline Lucas, Ria Oomen-Ruijten

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production		
<b>References</b>	COM(2005)0221 - C6-0190/2005 - 2005/0099(CNS)		
<b>Date of consulting Parliament</b>	13.6.2005		
<b>Committee responsible</b> Date announced in plenary	AGRI 22.6.2005		
<b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b> Date announced in plenary	ENVI 22.6.2005		
<b>Rapporteur(s)</b> Date appointed	Thijs Berman 15.6.2005		
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	10.10.2005	22.11.2005	26.1.2006
<b>Date adopted</b>	26.1.2006		
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 34	-: 1	0: 2
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Peter Baco, Katerina Batzeli, Thijs Berman, Giuseppe Castiglione, Albert Deß, Gintaras Didžiokas, Michl Ebner, Carmen Fraga Estévez, Duarte Freitas, Jean-Claude Fruteau, Ioannis Gklavakis, Bogdan Golik, Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf, María Esther Herranz García, Elisabeth Jeggle, Heinz Kindermann, Stéphane Le Foll, Kartika Tamara Liotard, Albert Jan Maat, Diamanto Manolakou, Mairead McGuinness, Neil Parish, María Isabel Salinas García, Agnes Schierhuber, Willem Schuth, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Marc Tarabella, Witold Tomczak, Kyösti Virrankoski, Janusz Wojciechowski, Andrzej Tomasz Zapałowski		
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Wiesław Stefan Kuc, Vincenzo Lavarra, Véronique Mathieu, Markus Pieper, Zdzisław Zbigniew Podkański, Karin Resetarits		
<b>Date tabled</b>	1.2.2006	A6-0017/2006	