

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

Session document

FINAL
A6-0290/2006

19.9.2006

REPORT

on a Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006-2010
(2006/2046(INI))

Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

Rapporteur: Elisabeth Jeggle

CONTENTS

	Page
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION.....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	14
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE.....	19
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY	24
PROCEDURE.....	31

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on a Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006-2010 (2006/2046(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on a Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006-2010 (COM(2006)0013),
 - having regard to the Commission Working Document on a Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals and the accompanying impact assessment (COM(2006)0014 and SEC(2006)0065),
 - having regard to the Protocol on protection and welfare of animals annexed to the EC Treaty (Treaty of Amsterdam),
 - having regard to Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 1986 on the approximation of laws, regulations and administrative provisions of the Member States regarding the protection of animals used for experimental and other scientific purposes¹,
 - having regard to Community rules on the protection of livestock,
 - having regard to the 7th Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development, which is currently under preparation (COM(2005)0119),
 - having regard to the communication from the Commission to the Spring European Council entitled 'Working together for growth and jobs – A new start for the Lisbon Strategy' (COM(2005)0024),
 - having regard to the Commission's guidelines of 15 June 2005 concerning impact assessments (SEC(2005)0791),
 - having regard to the mandate given to the Commission for the WTO negotiations in the field of agriculture, as laid down in the EC's Proposal for Modalities in the WTO Agriculture Negotiations (document reference 625/02) of January 2003,
 - having regard to Rule 45 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development and the opinions of the Committee on International Trade and the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (A6-0290/2006),
- A. whereas all action designed to ensure the protection and welfare of animals must be based on the principle that animals are sentient beings whose specific needs must be taken into account, and also that the protection of animals is an expression of humanity in the 21st

¹ OJ L 117, 5.5.1987, p. 31

century and a challenge facing European civilisation and culture,

- B. whereas in recent years Europe has adopted wide-ranging animal protection legislation and achieved one of the highest levels of animal protection in the world; whereas the European Parliament has repeatedly stressed that it regards this process as essential; whereas a high level of animal protection in Europe meets the demands of the public for ethically and socially acceptable products,
- C. whereas animal protection affects a number of policy areas and is relevant to many ethical, social, political and economic issues; whereas animal protection must not be confined to the protection and welfare of animals used in experiments or farm animals, but must also extend to other groups of animals, such as domestic, zoo, circus and wild animals,
- D. whereas there is a link between animal protection, animal health and product safety; whereas alternative testing methods and a high level of animal protection from breeding through to slaughter can have a positive impact on product safety and quality,
- E. whereas, in order to further develop animal protection in the Community, it is necessary to step up research efforts and to integrate animal protection into all relevant impact assessments, as well as to involve all interest groups in the decision-making process; whereas transparency and acceptance as well as uniform application of, and monitoring of compliance with, existing provisions at all levels are a prerequisite for a successful animal protection strategy in Europe,
- F. whereas an animal protection strategy must aim to take due account of increased costs entailed by animal protection; whereas, without a European and worldwide dialogue and a strong information strategy at home and abroad highlighting the benefits of high animal protection standards, an ambitious animal protection policy can only achieve limited success if it is merely pursued unilaterally by the European Union,
- G. whereas it is essential that European animal protection policy is accompanied by a coherent trade policy and one which recognises the fact that, in spite of the EU's efforts, animal welfare concerns were not addressed by either the July 2004 Framework Agreement or any other key documents of the Doha round of WTO negotiations; whereas it is therefore not viable to introduce further animal welfare standards which might have negative effects on the international competitiveness of producers until there is a fundamental change in the attitude of the EU's main partners in the WTO,
- H. whereas recognition of the so called non-trade concerns, which include animal welfare, has not been a priority for the Commission in its WTO negotiations; whereas recognition of non-trade concerns is consequently not expected to form part of any final agreement unless the Commission changes tack in the negotiations dramatically,
- I. whereas there is a danger that, if it is confined to the European market, an effective strategy to promote the welfare of farm animals may result in the elimination of a fringe of European producers,
- J. whereas any harmonisation of the protection of farm animals within the European Union

must be accompanied by regulation of imports in the light of the same objective in order to avoid placing European producers at a disadvantage on the European market,

- K. whereas implementation of the 3 Rs principle (replacement, reduction, refinement) in order to reduce the use of animals in research, science and product authorisation is a cornerstone of European animal protection policy,
1. Welcomes the Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006 - 2010, which for the first time translates the Protocol on protection and welfare of animals annexed to the Amsterdam Treaty into an integrated approach to developing animal protection in Europe;
 2. Is concerned that the Commission merely proposes to 'strive to ensure' that full regard is paid to animal welfare in the context of related policy fields;
 3. Considers it imperative to introduce a process for assessing the EU's animal welfare policy in fulfilling its legal obligations, as set out in the Protocol on protection and welfare of animals annexed to the Treaty;
 4. Regards improved animal protection as a permanent obligation of the Community, and therefore calls on the Commission to report in due course on the progress achieved and, on that basis, to submit a communication on taking forward the Action Plan after 2010;
 5. Calls on the Commission and the Member States, within the scope of their respective areas of competence, to further develop animal protection and to fully take account of the protection and welfare of all animals; calls on the Commission to work towards a pan-European ban on the castration of piglets without anaesthetic;
 6. Regrets that the focus of European policy on animal welfare has so far been almost exclusively on the welfare and protection of farm animals;
 7. Welcomes the efforts by the Commission to develop and improve legislation on animal protection as well as the greater integration of animal protection into all Community policy areas and the use of the whole spectrum of possible measures (legislation, training, promotion, research, etc) with the aim of ensuring a high level of animal protection in the handling of animals at all levels;
 8. Considers that, since the role of each of these mechanisms will be different, policy research will be essential in identifying these roles and articulating them to stakeholders;
 9. Notes that many EU policies have animal welfare implications which are not covered by the Action Plan, such as sustainable development, the CITES Convention and trade and marketing standards, and underlines the importance of paying full regard to animal welfare issues in all relevant policy areas;
 10. Points out that, when introducing higher animal protection welfare standards, account should be taken of the specific situation of individual EU regions;
 11. Stresses that the Commission ensures the implementation of all the animal welfare

provisions in EU law which are currently valid and that these should remain in force;

12. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to see to it that all legislation is uniformly applied and monitored in the European Union on the basis of the rules of cross compliance and, in the event of infringements, to take rigorous action in order to maintain confidence in the rules in force and to ensure fair competition in the European Union;
13. Considers it necessary for the adoption of measures to improve animal welfare to be seen from the standpoint of their socio-economic effects;
14. Calls on the Commission to integrate, on a systematic basis, the relevant impact assessments for all animal protection measures; considers that all impact assessments relating to new animal protection standards must examine all of the ethical, social and economic effects and must be based on the latest scientific knowledge, practical experience and developments at the international level; considers that these should highlight positive effects and take full account of the way in which different factors, such as animal protection, sustainability, animal health, the environment and product quality, impact on each other;
15. Acknowledges that high animal welfare standards lead to additional costs for farmers and considers that specific measures are necessary in order to prevent production displacement to those countries which have lower standards; calls therefore on the Commission to take account of job security aspects when carrying out impact assessments; considers that an accurate analysis of the costs of new proposals and their effects on the position of the business and research communities affected in the face of international competition is essential, in accordance with the revised Lisbon Agenda;
16. Stresses that setting appropriate time frames for adaptation, taking account of numbers of animals and the size of businesses and avoiding unnecessary red tape in connection with inspection and documentation will help ensure greater acceptance of the importance of animal protection on the part of those responsible; considers that the opportunities presented by the use of modern technologies and methods need to be adequately explored;
17. Points out that animal protection and animal health impact closely on each other; considers that the Action Plan should be implemented as far as possible in such a way as to ensure that, through greater animal protection, improvements in animal health are achieved and that animal health policy also always aims to bring about improvements in animal protection and that such improvements are measurable;
18. Calls on the Commission to take greater account of animal protection aspects in the fight against animal diseases; considers that regional vaccination in emergencies is essentially preferable to the killing of large numbers of healthy animals as a strategy for combating epizootics, albeit recognising the different attitudes to vaccination in each Member State and their potential effects on trade; considers moreover that, where technically possible, there ought to be greater scope for preventive vaccination; calls on the Commission to increase its efforts to adapt relevant treaties of the World organisation for animal health (OIE) accordingly, so that there are fewer restrictions on trade in products originating from vaccinated animals;

19. Welcomes the greater emphasis placed on animal protection under the Common Agricultural Policy; points out, however, that the resulting costs associated with red tape are already significantly too high; regrets, furthermore, the fact that the cut in funding for rural development policy will create practical obstacles to the financing of aid for stockbreeders to adapt to the Community rules on animal welfare; regrets that poultry and pig farmers are not being compensated for complying with Community animal welfare legislation under the cross compliance schemes;
20. Calls on the Commission and the Member States, within the context of rural development policy, to give favourable consideration to the use of all instruments available for animal protection;
21. Points out that, in practice, EU rules on the transport of animals (Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and Directive 95/29/EC) are frequently disregarded, particularly where the requirements for rest breaks and the provision of water and animal feed are concerned; calls, therefore, upon the Council and the Commission to take appropriate action in order to ensure that the Member States increase the number and the effectiveness of the checks carried out on the application of EU rules;
22. Points out that, with regard to the transport of animals, it is absolutely essential to introduce and take account of scientifically-based animal protection indicators (relating to suitable technology, time frames, trained staff) and that when those indicators are established, account should be taken of variations in climate between Member States, in view of the varying levels of adaptation of animals to the environment; calls on the Commission, therefore, to promote research aimed at defining and introducing objective and specific technical parameters enabling a better definition of animal welfare during transport, with a view, additionally, to defining integrated certification systems which will also take account of the influence of the various climatic and structural characteristics of Europe's regions on the animals and on transport modes and times;
23. Points out that by 2010 the Commission should submit a report to the European Parliament and the Council on space allowances and maximum journey times for animals being transported, accompanied by appropriate legislative proposals;
24. Considers that the support for the 3Rs principle and support for future trends in animal welfare research are two separate issues and that Objective 4 should be divided into two objectives to reflect this;
25. Welcomes the research efforts announced in the field of animal protection; considers that, in addition to generally widening the knowledge base, research should focus on the development of animal health indicators that are transparent and easy to apply, certification and labelling systems and alternatives to animal testing (3Rs principle);
26. Calls on the Commission to ensure that, where appropriate, scientifically proven indicators have been developed, they should be included in existing and new animal protection legislation to the greatest extent possible; in other words, preference should be given to goal prescriptions instead of means prescriptions;
27. Calls on the Commission to ensure that any future revision of the rules on animal welfare

is based on objective indicators, so as to avoid arbitrary decisions having unjustified economic repercussions for stockbreeders;

28. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to ensure that adequate resources are made available for research into the protection and welfare of all animals under the Seventh Research Framework Programme to actually achieve the objectives of the Action Programme; urges that particular stress be laid on research aimed at establishing objective indicators for animal welfare, and that account be taken of variations in climate within the EU when those indicators are established;
29. Calls on the Commission to support research and development concerning electronic systems for animal identification, with a view to developing monitoring and controls in respect of animal welfare in ways that are rapid and easily verifiable in the course of transport, including long-distance transport;
30. Calls on the Commission to ensure that technology platforms and research work undertaken under the Six Research Framework programme which, as for example in the case of 'PredTox', will make a significant contribution to achieving the objectives of the Action Programme, are able to be continued under the Seventh Research Framework Programme without entailing red tape;
31. Considers that it is necessary to fully take account of the 3Rs principle; welcomes the efforts by the Commission to develop Directive 86/609/EEC on animals used for experimental purposes; encourages the Commission to submit relevant legislative proposals this year; desires the Commission to set out, in this connection, how uniform implementation and monitoring of the provisions can be ensured;
32. Considers that as part of the proposed revision of EU legislation on animal testing the scope of Directive 86/609/EEC should be widened to cover basic research and research using animals for teaching purposes;
33. Calls on the Commission to plead at the international level, notably at the WTO and the OIE, for a single legislative standard for requirements relating to animal protection and animal testing in connection with product authorisation and for the recognition of alternative protection methods validated in Europe; considers that the development, validation and acceptance of non-animal methods must be accelerated and that increased funding, personnel and administrative support must be provided at every stage to ensure the fastest possible replacement of animal experimentation;
34. Calls upon the EU regulatory bodies to accept without delay the non-animal tests already validated by ECVAM (European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods);
35. Recognises that poor quality science is both unethical and a waste of resources and that the EU should require that all new, revised and existing human and environmental safety tests be fully validated in accordance with modern standards before such tests are required, recommended or endorsed under Community legislation or strategies;
36. Calls on the Commission, before setting up an additional Community body for animal protection, to improve links between existing Community institutions which deal with

animal protection issues;

37. Welcomes the efforts by the Commission to develop and explore the use of animal protection labelling; considers that such labelling would enable consumers to make informed purchasing decisions; considers that it should be aimed to include processed products in such a labelling system;
38. Considers that consumers should be informed and prepared to pay higher prices for products originating from farms with higher animal welfare standards and that these products should be appropriately labelled;
39. Considers that the report to the European Parliament and the Council scheduled for 2008 concerning the possibility of a compulsory labelling system for poultry meat and poultry meat products based on compliance with animal welfare standards should particularly concentrate on compliance with animal welfare standards which go beyond the minimum requirements; takes the view that a labelling programme based on standards higher than the legal minimum would solve the recognised problem faced by consumers who would like to buy a product which has been produced with particular concern for animal welfare but are unable to identify such products in the shops;
40. Calls on the Commission to ensure that labelling is transparent, easily comprehensible and reliable; considers that an 'EU label' would already imply a guarantee of compliance with the animal protection standard of a simple and mandatory nature for all products sold in Europe; considers that in the case of protection going beyond that required by the minimum standards, a special mention on the label would allow greater visibility to the consumer for additional efforts made by the producer, increase pressure on trading partners to adopt European animal protection standards and standards and, by doing this, enable Europe to export its animal welfare standards globally; emphasizes the role of private labels particularly as regards higher animal welfare standards;
41. Calls for financial support by the Commission for national information and sales promotion measures for animal food products pursuant to Commission Regulation (EC) No 1071/2005 of 1 July 2005 to be awarded on the basis of production standards relating to animal welfare; takes the view, therefore, that the 'European Quality Standard for products emanating from high animal welfare production systems' whose drafting the Commission provides for in the Action Plan should therefore be dealt with as a priority;
42. Welcomes the proposal to make it easier for consumers to recognise the proposed marketing and information systems, but at the same time stresses the necessity of facilitating their application for the benefit of all parties in the food chain;
43. Fundamentally supports the announced intention to develop and explore the use of integrated and uniform animal protection indicators; considers that such indicators must have a sound scientific basis, must be objective, measurable and repeatable, and must help ensure that animal protection standards are transparent; considers that it is necessary to integrate animal health aspects into such indicators; considers that integrated and uniform indicators should facilitate monitoring, reduce red tape and yield scientific results which are comparable for all Member States;

44. Calls on the Commission to complete the development of, and research into, integrated animal protection indicators within three years;
45. Calls on the Commission to present the communication strategy announced by it as soon as possible and to implement it rigorously; believes that the Action Plan can only be successful if all stakeholders are adequately informed of the benefits which the high level of animal protection in Europe brings for animals and products;
46. Considers that the potential of high welfare assurance schemes to improve animal protection is undermined by competition from cheaper products which come from assurance schemes that ensure standards of welfare no higher than the legal minimum and that a legal framework is therefore needed which sets minimum standards for quality assurance;
47. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to widen their efforts to inform consumers; considers that existing support instruments should be reviewed with the aim of facilitating the conducting of relevant marketing and information campaigns;
48. Welcomes the setting up of an animal protection information forum, which should aim to promote the exchange of information on current developments in the area of animal protection, scientific knowledge and, in particular, examples of best practice;
49. Agrees that a European strategy for the promotion of communication concerning animal welfare in the European Union and abroad is needed in order to explain to the public the various systems of animal production and the costs and benefits of stricter animal welfare standards; considers that this should be pursued independently, under the aegis of the proposed centre or laboratory;
50. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to make available adequate resources for training, further training and consultancy, for example using funding from the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD);
51. Considers that, at a time when wide-ranging liberalisation of conditions of access to agricultural markets is planned, the introduction of new higher standards in the EU-25 without standardisation under WTO, could lead to a decline in the competitiveness of Community production;
52. Regrets that some elements of food production are moving outside the EU in response to the animal welfare and protection standards that are currently in place, and therefore urges the Commission to assess the extent of this trend;
53. Calls on the Commission to provide compensation for the financial losses suffered by Community producers who increase the cost of their production by implementing animal welfare measures;
54. Points out that in many cases higher animal protection standards lead to additional costs; notes, however, that, within the context of free world trade, animal protection aspects have to date played only a subordinate role, which can lead to 'animal protection dumping' and disadvantages for European producers in Europe and on third country markets; suggests

therefore an instrument of qualified market access which would prevent EU animal welfare standards being undermined by imposing levies on products which do not meet EU standards;

55. Welcomes, therefore, all measures and initiatives by the Commission to further consensus at the international level on the importance of high animal protection standards; considers that it is essential and a priority to aim to further develop animal protection standards within the framework of the OIE and enhance the legal standing thereof through the WTO; considers that the objective should be to ensure as high and uniform as possible a level of animal protection worldwide; calls on the Commission, in the meanwhile, not to increase the distortions of competition suffered by Community producers by introducing new binding, detailed and uniform standards;
56. Calls on the Commission to promote explicit recognition of the high standard of EU's animal welfare rules in upcoming reviews of the WTO SPS Agreement and other WTO agreements, as appropriate;
57. Regrets that animal welfare is not part of the current round of negotiations at the WTO; insists that the Commission protect European standards, conscious of the additional costs that EU producers face as a result of complying with these standards;
58. Urges the strengthening of animal protection within the framework of the WTO; calls on the Commission to strongly urge, within the framework of the Doha Round, that animal protection be included in the negotiation agenda as a non-trade concern and that support measures to promote animal protection within the framework of rural development policy be recognised as qualifying, unreservedly, for inclusion in the 'green box';
59. Calls on the Commission to strive for recognition of the non-trade concerns in the framework of the WTO or further consensus at the international level on animal protection standards before sharpening legislation on animal protection within the European Union;
60. Points out that WTO trade rules do not restrict the validation of production systems, as implied by the original wording of the Communication and that it is therefore possible and desirable to validate production systems that apply significantly higher welfare standards than the minimum requirements;
61. Supports the Commission in its aim to incorporate animal protection into bilateral trade (e.g. with Chile and Canada) or veterinary agreements, complementing the multilateral strategy, and to develop discussion with third countries and their representatives on animal protection issues;
62. Considers that all current and future bilateral agreements with third countries which address sanitary and phytosanitary measures should establish objectives both to ensure that animal products from third countries are produced at least to standards of animal welfare comparable with those of the EU, and that those standards are communicated to the European consumer;
63. Calls on the Commission and the Member States to set up activities to encourage importers of animal products into the European Union to demand at least the EU legal

level of animal welfare standards from their suppliers;

64. Welcomes the announcement of a dialogue with developing countries on the additional market opportunities which high animal protection standards offer them; calls on the Commission to support developing countries in meeting animal protection standards as part of existing and new 'aid for trade' programmes;
65. Welcomes the efforts of the Commission to help developing countries contribute to international standard setting by means of trade-related assistance;
66. Welcomes the work the Commission has done through trade-related technical assistance (TRTA) projects with developing countries, for example by helping their experts to attend meetings on international standard-setting, and by sending EU technical experts to developing countries; notes that third country representatives can already participate in EU training courses organised for Member States' competent authorities on implementing EU animal welfare rules and believes that in order for developing countries to be able to take full advantage of trade opportunities, the Community should meet requests to provide analysis, training, research and financial support through both bilateral and multilateral development initiatives; further believes that improving animal welfare will often benefit such countries directly – financially, in food production and in environmental protection;
67. Believes that the Community's decision to prohibit the import of hormone-treated beef has been fully justified by scientific studies and calls on Canada and the US to remove their unjustified, WTO-incompatible sanctions on European goods without further delay;
68. Welcomes the proposed ban on imports of dog and cat fur and calls on the Commission to propose a total import ban on seal products and 'cruelty products' from third countries, such as fur from animals skinned alive, fur from animal breeding farms with no veterinary control and pharmaceutical products based on endangered species, and wherever low production standards are a threat to the environment and biodiversity;
69. Calls on the Commission to submit proposals to make the temporary ban on EU imports of birds caught in the wild on ethical, health and welfare grounds permanent;
70. Is concerned that the trade in exotic animals threatens both biodiversity and animal welfare; believes that biodiversity implications should be taken into account when devising animal welfare policy on the transboundary problems referred to in the Communication;
71. Expresses concern about the suffering of fighting animals; calls upon the European Community to bring an end to dog, bull and cock fighting, through national or community legislation as appropriate, and by ensuring that those involved receive no state or national subsidy relating to their activities;
72. Considers that the submission of a report to the European Parliament and the Council on the influence of genetic parameters on the welfare of broiler breeders and broiler chickens, for 2010, should be accompanied by appropriate legislative proposals;
73. Calls for Bulgaria and Romania to already be guided by the Community's animal

protection objectives and to implement and enforce all existing EU animal welfare legislation before January 2007 or, if transition periods have been agreed as part of their accession treaties, at least within that period;

74. Considers that, before the accession of a new Member State to the European Union, the Commission should check whether the European Union's animal welfare legislation is being properly implemented and whether national monitoring of compliance therewith is adequate;
75. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and Commission.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Introduction

It is the aim of all policy on the protection and welfare of animals (hereinafter referred to as animal protection) to treat animals as fellow creatures, taking account of their specific needs. The so-called five freedoms, which include, for example, keeping animals in conditions appropriate to the respective species, providing them with adequate feed and drinking water and preventing pain, injury and disease, provide a basis for current animal protection policy.

An integrated animal protection policy must, in addition to the protection of livestock, also cover wild animals, domestic animals and other animals entrusted to the care of humans.

In recent years, the European Community and its Member States and the Council of Europe have continuously extended their animal protection legislation and stepped up research efforts in this area.

At Community level, minimum standards have been laid down for animal testing and for breeding, farming, transport and slaughter of livestock as well as detailed rules on calves, pigs and laying hens. A Council decision on the Commission proposal on minimum rules for the protection of chickens kept for meat production (COM(2005)0221), which was already approved by the European Parliament in principle in February 2006 (A6-0017/2006), is still awaited.

Not least on the basis of the Protocol on animal protection annexed to the Amsterdam Treaty, which requires the Community to pay regard to animal protection when formulating and implementing relevant policies, Europe has developed a very high level of animal protection, which compares very well at the international level.

Hand-in-hand with efforts at state level, business and the research sector have also significantly stepped up their efforts to protect animals in connection with the use of animals for scientific purposes. There have been significant improvements in recent years in the keeping of animals for scientific research purposes. In addition, the research sector and business have developed a large number of alternatives to animal testing in order to translate the 3Rs principle into practice.

In the area of food production and food trade, there are different animal protection-related certification and labelling systems, which in some cases guarantee a level of animal protection significantly higher than the legally required minimum protection.

New techniques and methods or intensive animal farming are not detrimental per se, but can also create new opportunities for improving animal protection.

Scientific developments, changes in techniques and methods and new knowledge about the behaviour and needs of animals mean that the context within which animal protection policy is conducted is constantly changing. The Community's policy in this area is required to

continually take account of these new requirements.

At the international level, initial efforts are being made to strengthen animal protection, for example within the framework of the OIE (World Organisation for Animal Health). However, these efforts are nowhere near sufficient. To date, for example, virtually no rules have been laid down within the WTO (World Trade Organization). International discussions on avoiding or reducing animal testing in connection with product authorisation have so far not achieved the desired success.

Animal protection can entail costs. Consumers expect the Community to implement high animal protection standards, but, because of ignorance or lack of confidence in the implementation of existing standards, are still all too rarely prepared to bear the additional costs.

Action plan

The objective of the Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006-2010 is to bring together Community activities previously spread across different Commission services, councils and policy areas and to structure them in accordance with uniform guidelines.

The Action Plan is divided into five areas of activity:

1. upgrading existing minimum standards for animal protection and welfare (hereinafter referred to as animal protection),
2. research on animal protection and application of the 3Rs principle,
3. labelling and standardised animal protection indicators,
4. greater involvement of the public and of animal keepers/ handlers,
5. international efforts.

The Commission intends to further develop the existing minimum standards and, on the basis of agreements reached at Council of Europe level, to propose minimum standards for other species of animals.

Existing research efforts are to be continued and extended. Based on close cooperation between industry, those responsible and the Commission, an Action Plan for implementing the 3Rs principle is already to be submitted this year.

The Commission intends to step up its efforts to establish standardised animal protection indicators. The aim of such indicators is to make the level of animal protection in Europe more transparent, to facilitate monitoring and to help prepare for the introduction of EU animal protection labelling.

Consumer information and training of animal keepers/ handlers are to be extended, and a communication strategy drawn up.

The animal protection strategy additionally has an international dimension. The Commission intends to continue to make efforts to incorporate animal protection into multilateral and bilateral trade and veterinary agreements.

Certain specialist tasks of the Community in the area of animal protection are to be concentrated in the hands of a European centre or laboratory for animal protection.

Assessment

The Action Plan represents an important intermediate step with regard to the Community's animal protection policy. The combining together and integrating of Community and Member State tasks, on the basis of the Action Plan, is necessary in order to make further progress in the area of animal protection. On the basis of an assessment of progress achieved, the Action Plan should be taken forward after 2010.

Parliament is very largely in agreement with the line taken in the Action Plan. It is only necessary to draw attention to a few points:

- Animal protection is an issue that concerns everyone. Not only the Commission, but also the Member States, associations, business and the research sector need to contribute, within the scope of their respective responsibilities and the possibilities open to them, to implementing the Action Plan. Animal protection will only be credible if it extends to all animals. It must not be restricted solely to animals used for research purposes and in agriculture.
- Animal protection policy can only be further developed in cooperation with all those responsible. To that end, an open dialogue is needed at all levels.
- Animal protection is an important Community goal. It must be taken into account at an early stage in the planning of relevant policies and measures. Moreover, however important animal protection is, the Community must not disregard the interplay of different factors or possible conflicts of aims. The impact on jobs and location factors should be taken into account in accordance with the Lisbon Strategy. Bureaucracy must be kept to a minimum, and where necessary aid must be granted to help adapt to new standards.
- The immediate development of a communication strategy is a priority. Animal protection can only be effective if all those affected and consumers at home and abroad are adequately informed of the level of animal protection in Europe and its benefits for animals and products.

Attention should be paid to ensuring balanced communication; discriminating against certain kinds of farming without giving objective reasons would be counterproductive.

Proper training of animal handlers at all levels is in many cases more important for animal protection than new technical provisions. This particularly requires action by the Member States.

- The labelling system which it is aimed to introduce must be transparent and easily

comprehensible, as otherwise the message will not get across to consumers. Simple information carried by all products sold in Europe on compliance with minimum standards is preferable - subject to taking account of special cases, for example eggs - to more clearly graded systems. This would at the same time encourage implementation of these minimum requirements in other parts of the world. More far-reaching animal protection measures taken by individual producers could, however, additionally be recognised through participation in special quality programmes. Processed products should be included if possible.

- The Commission and the Member States must ensure, by applying existing standards in a uniform way and strictly monitoring compliance, including in the area of animal testing, that confidence in the level of animal protection achieved in Europe is not undermined by those who exploit the system.
- The success of the Action Plan can only be ensured by making available adequate financial resources for research in all areas. Knowledge of the behaviour and needs of animals is very limited. Labelling and animal protection standards must also be further developed, as well as alternatives to animal testing.
- It is important to continue existing research projects and technology platforms where necessary and to strengthen research in areas of priority importance for implementing the Action Plan. The transition from the Sixth to the Seventh Research Framework Programme should involve as little red tape as possible, in order not to jeopardise research work under way which is vital to the implementation of this Action Programme. An example of this is the 'PredTox' project, which is being conducted jointly by academic institutions and industry, and which is aimed at improving the predictive ability of alternative testing methods and providing appropriate data and databases.

In this context, it remains important to adapt Directive 86/609/EEC in line with current knowledge and to continue to harmonise rules on animal testing in the Community.

- European animal protection policy can only be successful if it has an additional international dimension. European producers must not be at a disadvantage in the face of competition from producers from regions with lower animal protection standards.

There is not as yet, however, a very clear consensus at the international level on animal protection. Efforts by the Commission to bring animal protection to a greater extent within the OIE framework, and above all within the WTO framework, should be significantly stepped up. Since the Commission submitted its 2002 Communication (COM(2002)626 final) on animal welfare legislation on farmed animals in third countries and the implications for the EU, the situation has scarcely changed. It is essential that animal protection is recognised as a non-trade concern and that animal protection-related support is recognised as qualifying, unreservedly, for inclusion in the 'green box'.

In order for substantial progress to be achieved in the area of animal testing,

alternatives to animal testing in connection with product authorisation must also be accepted at the international level.

Imports of dog and cat fur and seal products into the Community must be banned as quickly as possible. The Commission has repeatedly signalled such a ban, but nothing has happened to date.

- As regards the proposal to set up a new Community animal protection body, it is far too early for a decision to be taken. The EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), FVO (Food and Veterinary Office), ECVAM (European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods) and technology platforms already carry out a large proportion of the tasks which, according to the report, could possibly be entrusted to a new body. Instead of setting up a new body, it is more appropriate to improve links between existing bodies.

20.6.2006

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

for the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

on the protection and welfare of animals 2006-2010
(2006/2046(INI))

Draftswoman: Caroline Lucas

SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on International Trade calls on the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

1. Recalls that the EU has recognised the importance of improved protection and respect for the welfare of animals as sentient beings since the conclusion of the Amsterdam Treaty and believes that the Commission's trade policy should support this European value;
2. Calls on all the European institutions to recognise animal welfare as a European core value so as to ensure that it will no longer be possible to invoke fundamental freedoms in order to oppose or block laws prohibiting cruelty to animals in any way;
3. Welcomes the Commission's commitment to promoting high animal welfare standards in the EU and at international level, including engaging with developing countries to explore trade opportunities based on welfare-friendly production systems and believes that this objective must complement other priorities within the WTO negotiations;
4. Welcomes the work the Commission has done through trade-related technical assistance (TRTA) projects with developing countries, for example by helping their experts to attend meetings on international standard-setting, and by sending EU technical experts to developing countries; notes that third country representatives can already participate in EU training courses organised for Member States' competent authorities on implementing EU animal welfare rules and believes that in order for developing countries to be able to take full advantage of trade opportunities, the Community should meet requests to provide analysis, training, research and financial support through both

bilateral and multilateral development initiatives; further believes that improving animal welfare will often benefit such countries directly – financially, in food production and in environmental protection;

5. Calls on the Commission, before any new Member State is admitted to the Union, both to ascertain that European animal welfare standards have been properly transposed and to examine the national checks to be carried out for the purposes of the Union's animal welfare legislation; believes that, to prepare the accession countries for this task, the Union should provide funding in the run-up to enlargement to finance training and information as well as checks on the transposition of EU animal welfare legislation;
6. Believes that the Community's decision to prohibit the import of hormone-treated beef has been fully justified by scientific studies and calls on Canada and the US to remove their unjustified, WTO-incompatible sanctions on European goods without further delay;
7. Acknowledges that higher animal welfare standards lead to additional costs for farmers and others using or producing animal products, and considers that, in order to prevent displacement of those industries to regions with lower standards, any initiative entailing an unwarranted loss of competitiveness will need to be carefully reviewed if it is not to be combined with the necessary compensation;
8. Believes that European animal welfare standards should be founded on a solid scientific basis and on an impact study covering not only socio-economic aspects, but also matters such as public health, animal health, and the environment;
9. Affirms that payments to farmers are subject to conditionality criteria including higher animal welfare standards; given that these payments are non-trade distorting and are included in the 'Green Box' on domestic support, asks the Commission to stress the high standards of its animal welfare measures in the WTO negotiations;
10. Considers food and other animal-based products produced to high welfare standards to be distinct products and, as a result, believes WTO rules allow such imports to be subject to different terms and conditions than those applied to products not meeting these standards, including through import bans where appropriate; calls on the Commission to present proposals in this sense;
11. Calls on the Commission to promote explicit recognition of the high standard of EU's animal welfare rules in upcoming reviews of the WTO SPS Agreement and other WTO agreements, as appropriate;
12. Welcomes the fact that the EU has started to incorporate animal welfare into bilateral agreements with third countries (e.g. Chile and Canada); considers that all current and future bilateral agreements with third countries which address sanitary and phytosanitary measures should establish objectives both to ensure that animal products from third countries are produced at least to standards of animal welfare comparable with those of the EU, and that those standards are communicated to the European consumer;
13. Notes the results of the 2005 Commission Eurobarometer surveys on consumer attitudes to animal welfare, which indicate that European consumers are attaching increasing

importance to the traceability and quality of food and other products, overwhelmingly stating that imported food products should be produced under animal welfare conditions at least as high as those applied in Europe, with over half of all European consumers willing to pay more for animal welfare-friendly food products; notes, however, that consumers feel that these products could be easier to identify and want clearer food labelling with regard to animal welfare standards, and therefore considers that information requirements, including mandatory labelling of products, should apply equally to those products produced within and outside the Community; urges the Commission, therefore, to press for inclusion of the IOE minimum standards in the WTO agreements on sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) measures and technical barriers to trade (TBT);

14. Considers that approaches to informing consumers should not be limited to labelling alone, and that a broader communication and education strategy should be employed in tandem to support the market for high welfare products;
15. Welcomes the decision to end export refunds for the export of live cattle for slaughter but notes that the continuation of trade in live animals may raise welfare issues, and also increases the risk of disease if transporters are not properly qualified; calls on the Commission, therefore, to set up training systems for operators and bring forward proposals to improve their knowledge, increase their awareness of welfare issues, and make the existing legislation easier to enforce;
16. Notes that standards for the transport of poultry were not covered by the new regulation on animal transport, due to the lack of scientific data at the time; notes, however, that an opinion of the European Food Safety Authority on the transport of poultry, fish and other species will soon provide recommendations as to where the current legislation needs to be upgraded, and therefore calls on the Commission to incorporate those recommendations at the earliest opportunity;
17. Acknowledges the importance of replacement, reduction and refinement of animal testing, and proposes that the Commission extends application of this principle to third countries through promoting acceptance of alternative non-animal test methods; harmonisation of information requirements so that re-testing does not occur when products are imported or exported; extension of mutual acceptance of data agreements through bilateral arrangements as well as existing OECD rules;
18. Shares the widespread public concern about cruelty to animals arising from trade in wild and farmed furs; calls for a ban on the production and import of goods made from seal skins or from cat or dog fur, or from fur obtained from wild animals, and for more effective enforcement of existing import bans;
19. Acknowledges that animal disease outbreaks occur regularly around the world and that international trade in animals and animal products could cause them to spread; notes the inherent difficulties in regularly vaccinating and maintaining vaccination records for densely stocked animals in transit; considers, particularly in the light of the spread of the bird-flu virus, that trade in wild birds represents a risk to human and animal health and biological diversity as well as to animal welfare, and the temporary ban should be made

permanent, in line with WTO provisions; calls at the same time on the Member States to coordinate and improve border controls with the goal of preventing the illegal import of wild birds;

20. Acknowledges that the value of the illegal trade in wild animal species is estimated to be second only to the international trade in illegal drugs and that the levels of exploitation and trade in some species are so high that their populations are being severely depleted; requires improved monitoring of imports of wild animals and wild animal products so that the Convention on Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) is upheld, and enforcement improved in order to save animals from the threat of extinction; considers that the EU could play a significant role in the control of the international trade in wildlife but needs to reflect more accurately the widespread public opposition to renewed ivory trading throughout Europe and the consistent support of the European Parliament for full protection of elephants under CITES;
21. Welcomes the decision of the Austrian Government to follow the long-standing Danish precedent and ban the use of wild animals in circuses, believing that this will help to reduce the trade in exotic species;
22. Notes that information on the sentience of fish has gradually accumulated over recent years and notes that the common fisheries policy includes a strategy for the sustainable development of European aquaculture, highlighting the need to improve the welfare of farmed fish; welcomes the Council of Europe recommendations on the treatment of farmed fish, and looks forward to the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) welfare guidelines for farmed fish; expresses concern over the impact of international trade in ornamental fish, which can lead to over-harvesting of popular species, damage to fragile coral reef environments through the use of the non-selective technique of sodium cyanide to capture fish and high degrees of mortality of fish associated with insensitive shipping and poor farming practices along the supply chain; considers that, if managed properly, the aquarium industry could support long-term conservation and sustainable use of coral reefs; therefore urges the Commission to consider what steps can be taken to reduce these problems;
23. Considers that the Commission should raise, within the OIE, the possibility of formulating animal welfare guidelines;
24. Calls on the Commission to develop Europe-wide minimum animal welfare standards and propose steps to implement those standards in the future;
25. Calls on the Commission to propose measures to enable taxes or tolls to be imposed with a view to limiting the unnecessarily lengthy transport of live animals, or to actively encourage such charges.

PROCEDURE

Title	The protection and welfare of animals 2006-2010	
Procedure number	2006/2046(INI)	
Committee responsible	AGRI	
Opinion by Date announced in plenary	INTA 16.3.2006	
Enhanced cooperation – date announced in plenary	No	
Drafts(wo)man Date appointed	Caroline Lucas 16.3.2006	
Previous drafts(wo)man		
Discussed in committee	21.3.2006	30.5.2006
Date adopted	19.6.2006	
Result of final vote	+: 20 -: 2 0: 1	
Members present for the final vote	Francisco Assis, Jean-Pierre Audy, Enrique Barón Crespo, Béla Glattfelder, Jacky Henin, Syed Kamall, Sajjad Karim, Alain Lipietz, Caroline Lucas, Erika Mann, David Martin, Javier Moreno Sánchez, Godelieve Quisthoudt-Rowohl, Tokia Saïfi, Peter Šťastný, Robert Sturdy, Gianluca Susta, Zbigniew Zaleski	
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Panagiotis Beglitis, Bastiaan Belder, Saïd El Khadraoui, Antolín Sánchez Presedo	
Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote	Marie Panayotopoulos-Cassiotou	
Comments (available in one language only)	...	

14.7.2006

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

for the Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

on the protection and welfare of animals 2006 - 2010
(2006/2046(INI))

Draftsman: Jonas Sjöstedt

SUGGESTIONS

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 suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

- A. having regard to the Commission Communication of 23 January 2006 to the European Parliament and the Council on a Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006-2010 (COM(2006)0013),
 1. Welcomes the Commission's action plan on the protection and welfare of animals; considers that many animals in the EU are treated badly and contrary to EU provisions and that growth and employment concerns cannot be the sole factors on which to base impact assessments; stresses that animals in the EU must be treated well and have the right to natural behaviour; stresses also that in this respect the Commission is legally bound particularly by Articles 37, 95(1) and (3), 174 and 175 of the EC Treaty and the Protocol on protection and welfare of animals annexed to the Amsterdam Treaty;
 2. Considers that legally binding measures should be submitted by the Commission, in particular those linked to the following proposed reports:
 - the implementation of Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes (2006),
 - amendment of Decision 2000/50/EC on the inspection of farm holdings (2006),
 - the report on the protection of calves kept for farming purposes (2008),

- the report on the protection of pigs kept for farming purposes (2009),
 - the report on the influence of genetic parameters on the welfare of broiler breeders and broiler chickens (2010);
3. Points out that, in the light of the latest disease outbreaks, the Commission should revise as soon as possible the Community legislation and detailed guidelines on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing, including killing for disease control purposes (foreseen only for 2007), and that it should, by 2010 at the latest, submit a report on the implementation of legislation on space and maximum journey times for the transport of animals (Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, Council Regulation (EC) No 411/1998);
 4. Regrets that the Commission Action Plan does not include any initiatives on the protection of circus animals and animals in zoos;
 5. Regrets further that the Commission Action Plan does not include any initiatives on the improvement of living conditions for animals kept for fur production in the EU as well as requirements for fur products imported into the EU;
 6. Considers that all EU rules in the field of animal protection should be minimum rules which allow Member States to retain or introduce stricter national rules;
 7. Emphasises that a priority list of actions, to be followed by legislative proposals, should be put together for different animal species and problem areas; such a list should include dairy cattle, adult bovines, aquaculture animals, and pigs and turkeys kept for fattening;
 8. Considers that the common agricultural policy (CAP) must be designed to avoid overproduction of meat and considers that good animal health is self-evidently a factor in production of high quality; calls therefore for the inclusion of all relevant animal welfare directives in the cross-compliance measures provided for in Council Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 on direct support schemes under the CAP ; recalls that education measures aimed at consumers and producers on animal welfare, tax mechanisms and measures based on research are all important tools in achieving improved animal welfare;
 9. Approves the intention to make more use of vehicle satellite navigation systems in the context of the protection and real time monitoring of animals during transport; points out, however, that in adopting Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, the Member States opted not to change transport times and area requirements even though that would have had very beneficial effects on the level of protection; considers therefore that several practical initiatives in these areas should be given priority in the action plan;
 10. Stresses that a maximum time limit of eight hours for the transport of animals for slaughter and animals for further fattening must be introduced within the EU by 2010 at the latest; calls also for the introduction of a ban on transporting calves younger than 12 weeks old;
 11. Points out that, in practice, EU rules on the transport of animals (Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and Directive 95/29/EC) are frequently disregarded, particularly where the

requirements for rest breaks and the provision of water and animal feed are concerned; calls, therefore, upon the Council and the Commission to take appropriate action in order to ensure that the Member States increase the number and the effectiveness of the checks carried out on the application of EU rules;

12. Considers that the objective must be for all rearing of laying hens to be free-range based by 2016 at the latest;
13. Considers that the rules on the protection of pigs should be revised and that existing legislation prohibiting the use of tethers on sows and gilts must be enforced in all Member States;
14. Considers that a ban on the castration of pigs without anaesthetic should be introduced;
15. Considers that sows should be allowed to roam freely throughout their life cycle;
16. Considers that an effective ban on tail docking should be introduced;
17. Considers that there should be free access to roughage;
18. Considers that the rules on chickens for meat production should be revised and that a maximum stocking rate of 25 kg/m² should be introduced;
19. Attaches the utmost importance to restricting farming practices which are particularly detrimental to animal welfare, such as the force-feeding of geese and ducks in connection with the production of foie gras; calls for the recommendations on the protection of ducks and geese which were issued under the 1999 European Convention for the protection of animals kept for farming to be implemented;
20. Welcomes the proposed ban on imports of dog and cat fur and calls on the Commission to propose a total import ban on "cruelty products" from third countries, such as fur from animals skinned alive, fur from animal breeding farms with no veterinary control and pharmaceutical products based on endangered species, and wherever low production standards are a threat to the environment and biodiversity;
21. Considers that Parliament's rejection on 13 December 2005 of the Commission proposal on introducing humane trapping standards for certain animal species (COM(2004)0532) (Scheele report A6-3004/2005), is no excuse for delaying a new proposal until 2009; calls therefore on the Commission to put forward a new legislative proposal;
22. Calls for the EU to undertake to promote recognition within the WTO scheme of the animal-welfare clause as a 'non-trade concern' clause;
23. Concerned that the trade in exotic animals threatens both biodiversity and animal welfare, believes that biodiversity implications should be taken into account when devising animal welfare policy on the transboundary problems referred to in the Communication;
24. Points out that trade in wild birds is often carried out in unacceptable conditions that lead

to the deaths of thousands of birds; considers that it represents a risk to human and animal health and to biological diversity, and that the temporary ban on imports of wild birds into the European Union should therefore be made permanent;

25. Considers that the EU's information campaigns should specifically target all players from producers to consumers, through a communication strategy tailored to the needs of each stakeholder group;
26. Considers that a European Strategy is needed for the communication of animal welfare issues to consumers both in the EU and in third countries, so as to explain differences in animal production as well as the costs and benefits of high animal welfare standards; points out that such a Strategy could be implemented under the aegis of the European Centre or Laboratory proposed by the Commission;
27. Calls for the inclusion of relevant NGOs, both in the EU and worldwide, in the consultation and legislative preparatory activities, and for the opening up of training programmes for those NGOs;
28. Considers that Action 5 of the Commission Action Plan, raising awareness initiatives and education on animal welfare, concerning for instance the keeping of animals and the transport and slaughtering of animals, should be directed at producers in South-East Asia as well as producers in the MEDA countries;
29. Is aware of the difficulties that the developing countries are likely to face in enhancing animal welfare-friendly production, and calls on the Community to back such initiatives with training, research and financial support as appropriate;
30. Notes that many EU policies have animal welfare implications which are not covered by the Action Plan, such as sustainable development, the CITES Convention and trade and marketing standards, and underlines the importance of paying full regard to animal welfare issues in all relevant policy areas;
31. Considers that when addressing transboundary problems in the area of animal welfare, wildlife conservation has to be taken into account;
32. Welcomes the application of the 3 Rs principle - reduction, replacement and refinement - in the context of animal experiments; considers that animal experiments should be allowed only where there are no alternatives; considers that support to the 3Rs principle and support to future trends in animal welfare research are two separate issues and that Objective 4 should be divided into two objectives to reflect this; stresses the need for rules to guarantee the public full insight into what animal experiments are taking place;
33. Calls on the Commission to strengthen the enforcement of Directive 86/609/EEC on animal testing by requiring that Article 7(2) thereof is fully applied and that the 3Rs principle (replacement, reduction and refinement) is used whenever possible; believes that new and existing legislation requiring animal tests should be subject to thorough scientific evaluation by independent experts to ensure that animal-based data requirements are minimised;

34. Considers that the Commission must ensure that industry's contributions to replacing animal experiments, which were agreed to on the basis of the 3Rs principle, are sustainable and delivered at the appropriate time; points out that the partnership action programme must also be open to review by representatives of animal welfare organisations;
35. Considers that the scope of Directive 86/609/EEC ('the animal experiments directive') should be extended to include protection of animals used in basic and applied research, certain invertebrate species, use of animals in science education, and foetal mammals from 50% gestation;
36. Considers that development, validation and acceptance of non-animal methods must be accelerated, and increased funding, personnel and administrative support must be provided at every stage to ensure the fastest possible replacement of animal experimentation;
37. Calls upon the EU regulatory bodies to accept without delay the non-animal tests already validated by ECVAM (European Centre for the Validation of Alternative Methods);
38. Calls on the Commission to arrange for all existing legislation requiring the use of animal tests to be reviewed by ECVAM or other independent experts with the object of identifying means of sharing data, avoiding duplication and reducing the need for experimentation;
39. Calls on the Commission to improve provisions for sharing vertebrate animal test data and avoiding duplicate animal testing, and to apply these to all areas of animal experimentation, and all legislation requiring animal testing, including sharing of data from unpublished and negative studies;
40. Calls on the Commission to ensure that industry contributions to replacing animal testing agreed through the European Partnership on Alternative Approaches (EPAA) are effective, open to scrutiny and delivered on time by both the industry and ECVAM;
41. Recognises that poor-quality science is both unethical and a waste of resources, and that the EU should require that all new, revised and existing human/environmental safety tests be fully validated according to modern standards before such tests are required, recommended or endorsed under EU legislation or Community Strategies;
42. Considers that there should be a right to use national labelling;
43. Considers that a voluntary scheme for the labelling of products produced with a higher level of animal welfare than the minimum rules should be introduced;
44. Considers that the rules on the feeding of calves should be tightened up to require that feed should be rich in fibre and considers, therefore, that there should be free access to roughage;

45. Highlights the need to carry out a mid-term review of the Action Plan by the end of 2008 and to evaluate how successful the Community has been in meeting its obligations;
46. Considers that the Action Plan is a first step in a continuous process of evaluating, planning and implementing measures to improve animal welfare; requests therefore the Commission to review regularly the progress achieved regarding the objectives set out in the Action Plan and to put forward a new Action Plan by 2011, based on that review process.

PROCEDURE

Title	Protection and welfare of animals 2006 - 2010	
Procedure number	(2006/2046(INI))	
Committee responsible	AGRI	
Opinion by Date announced in plenary	ENVI 16.3.2006	
Enhanced cooperation – date announced in plenary		
Draftsman Date appointed	Jonas Sjöstedt 11.5.2006	
Previous draftsman		
Discussed in committee	20.6.2006	12.7.2006
Date adopted	13.7.2006	
Result of final vote	+: 49 -: 2 0: 1	
Members present for the final vote	Adamos Adamou, Georgs Andrejevs, Johannes Blokland, John Bowis, Frieda Brepoels, Dorette Corbey, Chris Davies, Avril Doyle, Mojca Drčar Murko, Edite Estrela, Anne Ferreira, Karl-Heinz Florenz, Alessandro Foglietta, Matthias Groote, Françoise Grossetête, Satu Hassi, Marie Anne Isler Béguin, Dan Jørgensen, Christa Kläß, Holger Krahmer, Urszula Krupa, Marie-Noëlle Lienemann, Peter Liese, Linda McAvan, Roberto Musacchio, Péter Olajos, Adriana Poli Bortone, Frédérique Ries, Guido Sacconi, Karin Scheele, Carl Schlyter, Horst Schnellhardt, Richard Seeber, Kathy Sinnott, Jonas Sjöstedt, Bogusław Sonik, María Sornosa Martínez, Antonios Trakatellis, Thomas Ulmer, Anja Weisgerber, Åsa Westlund, Anders Wijkman	
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Bairbre de Brún, Jutta D. Haug, Karin Jöns, Caroline Lucas, Justas Vincas Paleckis, Amalia Sartori, Renate Sommer, Bart Staes, Glenis Willmott	
Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote	Jens-Peter Bonde	
Comments (available in one language only)	...	

PROCEDURE

Title	Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006-2010			
Procedure number	2006/2046(INI)			
Committee responsible Date authorisation announced in plenary	AGRI 16.3.2006			
Committee(s) asked for opinion(s) Date announced in plenary	INTA 16.3.2006	ENVI 16.3.2006	6	
Not delivering opinion(s) Date of decision	--	--		
Enhanced cooperation – Date announced in plenary	--	--		
Rapporteur(s) Date appointed	Elisabeth Jeggle 26.1.2006			
Previous rapporteur(s)	--			
Discussed in committee	25.4.2006	30.5.2006	22.6.2006	12.9.2006
Date adopted	12.9.2006			
Result of final vote	+: 37 –: -- 0: --			
Members present for the final vote	Marie-Hélène Aubert, Peter Baco, Thijs Berman, Niels Busk, Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, Giuseppe Castiglione, Joseph Daul, Albert Deß, Gintaras Didžiokas, Carmen Fraga Estévez, Duarte Freitas, Jean-Claude Fruteau, Ioannis Gklavakis, Lutz Goepel, Bogdan Golik, Friedrich-Wilhelm Graefe zu Baringdorf, Esther Herranz García, Elisabeth Jeggle, Heinz Kindermann, Stéphane Le Foll, Kartika Tamara Liotard, Albert Jan Maat, Mairead McGuinness, Rosa Miguélez Ramos, Neil Parish, María Isabel Salinas García, Agnes Schierhuber, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Csaba Sándor Tabajdi, Marc Tarabella, Kyösti Virrankoski, Janusz Wojciechowski and Andrzej Tomasz Zapalowski.			
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Bernadette Bourzai, Jan Mulder, Zdzisław Zbigniew Podkański and Armando Veneto.			
Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote	--			
Date tabled	19.9.2006			
Comments (available in one language only)	--			