

EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

Session document

A6-0185/2009

24.3.2009

REPORT

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the protection of animals at the
time of killing

(COM(2008)0553 – C6-0451/2008 – 2008/0180(CNS))

Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development

Rapporteur: Janusz Wojciechowski

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***. In the case of amending acts, passages in an existing provision that the Commission has left unchanged, but that Parliament wishes to amend, are highlighted in **bold**. Any deletions that Parliament wishes to make in passages of this kind are indicated thus: [...]. 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

	Page
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION	Error! Bookmark not defined.
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	Error! Bookmark not defined.
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, PUBLIC HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY	Error! Bookmark not defined.
PROCEDURE	Error! Bookmark not defined.

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing

(COM(2008)0553 – C6-0451/2008 – 2008/0180(CNS))

(Consultation procedure)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2008)0553),
 - having regard to Article 37 of the EC Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C6-0451/2008),
 - 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 (A6-0185/2009),
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.

Amendment 1

Proposal for a regulation

Title

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Proposal for a Council regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing

Proposal for a Council regulation on the protection of animals at the time of **slaughter and** killing

Justification

With reference to the definition provided in the proposal ("slaughter" means the killing of

animals for human consumption), the term "killing" seems recurrently inappropriate in a proposal dealing with animals generally farmed for "human consumption". As a general remark, the word "slaughter", referring specifically to slaughter and related operations, seems more coherent in this context and should be used consistently throughout the proposal.

Wherever necessary, the word 'killing' should be replaced by the word 'slaughtering' or 'slaughter', and the verb 'kill' should be replaced by 'slaughter'.

Amendment 2

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 6

Text proposed by the Commission

(6) The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has adopted two opinions on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing of certain species of animals, namely on the Welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing the main commercial species of animals, in 2004 and on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing applied to commercially farmed deer, goats, rabbits, ostriches, ducks, geese and quail, in 2006. Community legislation in this area should be updated to take into account those scientific opinions. Recommendations to phase out the use of carbon dioxide for pigs and poultry, **as well as to phase out the use of waterbath stunners for poultry** were not included in the proposal because the impact assessment revealed that they were not economically viable at present in the EU. Furthermore other recommendations should not be part of this Regulation because they refer to technical parameters that should be part of implementing measures or codes of good practices. Recommendations on farm fish were not included in the proposal because there was a need for further scientific opinion and economic evaluation in this field.

Amendment

(6) The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has adopted two opinions on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing of certain species of animals, namely on the Welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing the main commercial species of animals, in 2004 and on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing applied to commercially farmed deer, goats, rabbits, ostriches, ducks, geese and quail, in 2006. ***In 2001 the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW) adopted a report on The Welfare of Animals Kept for Fur Production which included an analysis of the slaughter methods used in fur farms.*** Community legislation in this area should be updated to take into account those scientific opinions. Recommendations to phase out the use of carbon dioxide for pigs and poultry were not included in the proposal because the impact assessment revealed that they were not economically viable at present in the EU. Furthermore other recommendations should not be part of this Regulation because they refer to technical parameters that should be part of implementing measures or codes of good practices. Recommendations on farm fish

were not included in the proposal because there was a need for further scientific opinion and economic evaluation in this field.

Justification

The report by the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare contains an analysis of the welfare implications of the various methods used to kill animals on fur farms in the EU.

Amendment 3

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 15

Text proposed by the Commission

(15) The Protocol on protection and welfare of animals also underlines the need to respect the legislative or administrative provisions and customs of the Member States relating, in particular, to religious rites, cultural traditions and regional heritage when formulating and implementing the Community's policies on inter alia agriculture and the internal market. It is therefore appropriate to exclude from the scope of this Regulation cultural events, where compliance with animal welfare requirements would adversely affect the very nature of the event concerned.

Amendment

(15) The Protocol on protection and welfare of animals also underlines the need to respect the legislative or administrative provisions and customs of the Member States relating, in particular, to religious rites, cultural traditions ***or traditions of religious origin*** and regional heritage when formulating and implementing the Community's policies on inter alia agriculture and the internal market. It is therefore appropriate to exclude from the scope of this Regulation cultural, ***religious and traditional*** events, where compliance with animal welfare requirements would adversely affect the very nature of the event concerned.

Amendment 4

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 16

Text proposed by the Commission

(16) In addition, cultural traditions refer to

Amendment

(16) In addition, cultural traditions ***or***

an inherited, established, or customary pattern of thought, action or behaviour which includes in fact the concept of something transmitted by or acquired from a predecessor. They contribute to foster long-standing social links between generations. Provided that those activities do not affect the market of animal products **and are not motivated by production purposes**, it is appropriate to exclude **killings** of animals taking place during those events from the scope of this Regulation.

traditions of religious origin refer to an inherited, established, or customary pattern of thought, action or behaviour which includes in fact the concept of something transmitted by or acquired from a predecessor. They contribute to foster long-standing social links between generations. Provided that those activities do not affect the market of animal products, it is appropriate to exclude **the slaughter** of animals taking place during those events from the scope of this Regulation.

Amendment 5

Proposal for a regulation Article 22 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 22 a

Financial provisions

The above-mentioned new challenges will inevitably have significant financial implications for Union operators. In order to comply with the rules laid down in this Regulation, adequate EU funding must be made available to offer the financial support required to enable the Union sector to show leadership on animal welfare in the international context.

Amendment 6

Proposal for a regulation Recital 24

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(24) Depending on how they are used during the slaughtering or killing process,

(24) Depending on how they are used during the slaughtering or killing process,

some stunning methods can lead to death while avoiding pain and minimising distress or suffering for the animals.
Consequently, it is not necessary to make a distinction between reversible and non-reversible methods of stunning.

some stunning methods can lead to death while avoiding pain and minimising distress or suffering for the animals.

Justification

Some gassing methods used to stun slaughter animals for their fur are reversible and the animals regain consciousness. Since there is no further step in the killing process e.g. exsanguination it is possible that the animals could go on to be skinned while still conscious.

Amendment 7

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 32

Text proposed by the Commission

(32) Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 provides for a list of establishments from which imports into the Community of specified products of animal origin are permitted. The general requirements and the additional requirements applicable to slaughterhouses laid down in this Regulation should be taken into account for the purposes of that list.

Amendment

(32) Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 provides for a list of establishments from which imports into the Community of specified products of animal origin are permitted. The general requirements and the additional requirements applicable to slaughterhouses laid down in this Regulation should be taken into account for the purposes of that list. ***The Commission should ensure that importation of meat and meat products from third countries destined for the internal market comply with the general rules laid down in this regulation.***

Justification

Correspondence of the same rules is important to avoid market distortions.

Amendment 8

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 33

Text proposed by the Commission

(33) Slaughterhouses and the equipment used therein are designed for particular categories of animals and capacities. Where those capacities are exceeded or the equipment is used for purposes for which it was not designed, it has a negative impact on the welfare of animals. Information on these aspects should therefore be communicated to the competent authorities and should be part of the approval procedure for slaughterhouses.

Amendment

(33) Slaughterhouses and the equipment used therein are designed for particular categories of animals and capacities. Where those capacities are exceeded or the equipment is used for purposes for which it was not designed, it has a negative impact on the welfare of animals. Information on these aspects should therefore be communicated to the competent authorities and should be part of the approval procedure for slaughterhouses. ***Small, regularly inspected slaughterhouses with a slaughter capacity of up to 50 livestock units per week or 150 000 units of poultry per annum which mainly sell food directly to the final consumer do not require an onerous permit procedure in order to comply with the principles of this Regulation,***

Amendment 9

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 34 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(34a) It is necessary to avoid suffering to animals due to fear and stress before slaughter. It is therefore appropriate to design the construction of slaughterhouses, plan slaughterhouse procedures and train staff in such a way as to prevent animals from suffering stress, fear and pain between unloading and slaughter.

Amendment 10

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 35

Text proposed by the Commission

(35) Science and technical progress are regularly made with regard to the construction, layout and equipment of slaughterhouses. It is therefore important that the Community authorises the Commission for amending the requirements applicable to the construction, layout and equipment of slaughterhouses while keeping a uniform and high level of protection for animals.

Amendment

(35) Science and technical progress are regularly made with regard to the construction, layout and equipment of slaughterhouses. It is therefore important that the Community authorises the Commission for amending the requirements applicable to the construction, layout and equipment of slaughterhouses while keeping a uniform and high level of protection for animals.
Efforts to develop better stunning procedures should continue constantly. Research should also be stepped up in the field of alternatives to slaughtering surplus chicks.

Amendment 11

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 37

Text proposed by the Commission

(37) ***Killing*** without stunning requires an accurate cut of the throat to minimise suffering. In addition, animals that are not mechanically restrained after the cut are likely to slow down the bleeding process, thereby prolonging unnecessarily the suffering of the animals. Animals slaughtered without stunning should therefore be individually restrained.

Amendment

(37) ***Slaughter*** without stunning requires an accurate cut of the throat to minimise suffering. In addition, animals that are not mechanically restrained after the cut are likely to slow down the bleeding process, thereby prolonging unnecessarily the suffering of the animals. Animals slaughtered without stunning should therefore be individually restrained ***and receive effective stunning immediately after the cut.***

Justification

Consideration to religious slaughter is of course needed. However, in order to protect the animals from unnecessary suffering the basic requirement of post-stunning must apply.

Amendment 12

Proposal for a regulation Recital 38

Text proposed by the Commission

(38) Science and technical progress are regularly made with regard to the handling and restraining of animals at slaughterhouses. It is therefore important that the Community authorises the Commission for amending the requirements applicable to the handling and restraining of animals before **slaughter** while keeping a uniform and high level of protection for animals.

Amendment

(38) Science and technical progress are regularly made with regard to the handling and restraining of animals at slaughterhouses **and fur factory farms**. It is therefore important that the Community authorises the Commission for amending the requirements applicable to the handling and restraining of animals before **killing** while keeping a uniform and high level of protection for animals.

Justification

It would be inconsistent to exempt fur factory farms from this provision. The term 'slaughter' is defined in the Regulation as 'the killing of animals for human consumption' and would, therefore, exclude animals killed on fur factory farms from this provision.

Amendment 13

Proposal for a regulation Article 1 – paragraph 2 – point a – sub-point i

Text proposed by the Commission

i) **during technical or scientific experiments carried out under the supervision of the competent authority;**

Amendment

i) **in the context of the activities regulated by Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 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;**

¹ LOJ L 358, 18.12.1986, p. 1.

Justification

The term 'technical experiments' does not exist in Community regulations. Reference should be made to Council Directive 86/609/EEC of 24 November 1986. On that basis, the exclusion

should apply not just to animals that die during experiments but also to any animals covered by that Regulation – or, in other words, any animals used or intended for use in experiments, or which subsequently have to be put down as a result of an experiment.

Amendment 14

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – paragraph 2 – point a – sub-point ii

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

ii) during hunting activities;

ii) during hunting ***or recreational fishing*** activities;

Justification

Although it is only Article 3(1) that applies to fishing, it seems reasonable to exclude recreational fishing from the overall scope of the regulation, as is the case with hunting.

Amendment 15

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – paragraph 2 – point a – subparagraph iv a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

iv a) for major religious festivities involving traditional sacrifices for direct consumption, for example at Easter or Christmas and only for a period of ten days preceding the relevant dates.

Amendment 16

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – paragraph 2 – point b a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

b a) semi-domesticated deer, shot in the field and processed through a game farm facility

Justification

Semi-domesticated deer in Northern Europe, kept on extensive pasture are frequently killed with a free bullet head shot in the field adjacent to the processing facility. This procedure raises less welfare concerns than the killing of wild deer.

Amendment 17

Proposal for a regulation

Article 2 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) “related operations” means operations such as handling, lairaging, restraining, stunning **and** bleeding of animals taking place in the context and at the location where they are to be killed;

Amendment

(b) “related operations” means operations such as handling, **unloading**, lairaging, restraining, stunning, bleeding of animals taking place in the context and at the location where they are to be slaughtered;

Justification

It is important to make it clear that these protections extend to the unloading of the animals on arrival at the slaughterhouse.

Amendment 18

Proposal for a regulation

Article 2 – point b a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

b a) “competent authority” means the central authority of a Member State competent to ensure compliance with the requirements of this Regulation, or any other authority to which that central authority has delegated that competence;

Justification

A definition of ‘competent authority’ needs to be included, as this is a term which appears repeatedly in the text.

Amendment 19

Proposal for a regulation
Article 2 – point d a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

d a) "unconsciousness" means a state of unawareness in which there is temporary or permanent disruption to brain function and after which the animal is unable to respond to normal stimuli, including pain;

Justification

A clearer definition of "unconsciousness" is helpful for a clearer understanding of the text.

Amendment 20

Proposal for a regulation
Article 2 – point f

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

f) “stunning” means any intentionally induced process which causes loss of consciousness and sensibility ***without pain***, including any process resulting in instantaneous death;

f) “stunning” means any intentionally induced process which causes loss of consciousness and sensibility, including any process resulting in instantaneous death;

Justification

Most, if not all, stunning methods listed in the Annex cause pain to a greater or lesser extent, making for a contradiction between the definition and the method approved.

Amendment 21

Proposal for a regulation
Article 2 – point g

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

g) “religious rite” means a series of acts related to the slaughter of animals and prescribed by a religion ***such as Islam or Judaism***;

g) “religious rite” means a series of acts related to the slaughter of animals and prescribed by a religion ***or occasioned by specific religious festivities***;

Amendment 22

Proposal for a regulation Article 2 – point k

Text proposed by the Commission

k) “slaughterhouse” means **any** establishment used for slaughtering **terrestrial** animals;

Amendment

k) “slaughterhouse” means **an** establishment used for slaughtering **and dressing** animals, **the meat of which is intended for human consumption**;

Justification

The proposed definition is replaced with the one that already appears in Regulation 853/2004. It seems reasonable to use already-existing definitions and not to create a new one for each new regulation.

Amendment 23

Proposal for a regulation Article 2 – point m

Text proposed by the Commission

m) “fur animals” means animals of the mammal species primarily reared for the production of fur such as minks, polecats, foxes, raccoons, coypu and chinchillas;

Amendment

m) “fur animals” means animals of the mammal species primarily reared for the production of fur such as minks, polecats, foxes, raccoons, **raccoon dogs**, coypu, **rabbits** and chinchillas;

Justification

These species are bred for fur in the EU and so should be included in the definition of “fur animals”.

Amendment 24

Proposal for a regulation Article 3 – paragraph 2 – point a

Text proposed by the Commission

a) are provided with physical comfort and protection, in particular by being kept

Amendment

a) are provided with physical comfort and protection, in particular by being kept

clean, under thermal comfort and prevented from falling or slipping;

under thermal comfort and prevented from falling or slipping;

Justification

The request for clean animals seems inappropriate because this “condition” is already enclosed in the Hygiene Regulation. There is no need to replicate it. It is a question of hygiene, not specially related to animal welfare.

Amendment 25

Proposal for a regulation

Article 3 – paragraph 2 – point d

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

d) do not show signs of pain, *fear*, aggression or other abnormal behaviour;

d) do not show signs of pain, aggression or other abnormal behaviour;

Justification

Measures can be implemented to avoid suffering, but certainly not to ensure that animals do not show signs of fear, it is neither practicable nor realistic.

Amendment 26

Proposal for a regulation

Article 3 – paragraph 2 – point f

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

f) are prevented from adverse interaction. deleted

Justification

The term 'adverse interaction' is very vague and hence difficult to comply with and monitor compliance with.

Amendment 27

Proposal for a regulation

Article 4 – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2. By way of derogation from paragraph

2. In accordance with religious rites,

1, where such methods are prescribed by religious rites, animals may be **killed** without prior stunning, provided that the **killing** takes place in a slaughterhouse.

animals may be **slaughtered** without prior stunning, provided that the **slaughtering** takes place in a slaughterhouse.

Justification

The text proposed by the Commission is unclear. The nature of the derogation is not explained, and could cause ambiguity. The amendment seeks to clarify the situation and maintain the current status quo as regards ritual slaughter without prior stunning.

Amendment 28

Proposal for a regulation
Article 4 – paragraph 2 – point 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

However, Member States may decide not to apply that derogation. **deleted**

Justification

The various permissible means of slaughter need to be harmonised in order to ensure that all Community producers comply with the same animal welfare standards.

Amendment 29

Proposal for a regulation
Article 5 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1. Stunning shall be carried out in accordance with the methods set out in Annex I.

1. Stunning shall be carried out in accordance with the methods set out in Annex I. ***In order to take account of scientific and technical progress, the Commission may approve new stunning methods on the basis of an assessment by the European Food Safety Authority and in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 22(2).***

Justification

Recital 22 states that the Commission may authorise new stunning methods. This amendment

establishes the procedure to be followed in determining whether or not to approve a new stunning method.

Amendment 30

Proposal for a regulation

Article 5 – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

2. The personnel responsible for stunning shall carry out regular checks to ensure that the animals do not present any signs of consciousness or sensibility in the period between the end of the stunning process and ***the confirmation of*** death.

Amendment

2. The personnel responsible for stunning shall carry out regular checks to ensure that the animals do not present any signs of consciousness or sensibility in the period between the end of the stunning process and death.

Justification

The term ‘confirmation’ seems to imply a need for technical methods, which is clearly at odds with the standard and reasonable practices followed at slaughter centres.

Amendment 31

Proposal for a regulation

Article 5 – paragraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2 a. Bleeding shall start as soon as possible after stunning.

Justification

This clarification is needed in order to ensure that the animal dies during the period in which it is stunned.

Amendment 32

Proposal for a regulation
Article 5 – paragraph 3 – point 2

Text proposed by the Commission

However, any such amendments must ensure a level of animal welfare at least equivalent to that of the existing methods as demonstrated by scientific evidence ***published in appropriate, internationally recognised, peer reviewed journals.***

Amendment

However, any such amendments must ensure a level of animal welfare at least equivalent to that of the existing methods as demonstrated by ***appropriate*** scientific evidence.

Justification

The basic issue is that of the need for scientific evidence that will be assessed under the procedure set out in Article 22.

Amendment 33

Proposal for a regulation
Article 5 – paragraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

4. Community ***Codes of good practices*** concerning the methods set out in Annex I may be adopted in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 22(2).

Amendment

4. Community ***guidelines for the drawing up of procedures and implementation of rules*** concerning the methods set out in Annex I may be adopted in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 22(2).

Amendment 34

Proposal for a regulation
Article 6 – paragraph 2 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

2. Operators shall draw up and implement such standard operating procedures to ensure that ***killing*** and related operations are carried out in accordance with Article 3(1).

Amendment

2. Operators shall draw up and implement such standard operating procedures to ensure that ***slaughter*** and related operations are carried out in accordance with Article 3(1). ***To that effect, the procedures laid down in Article 5 of Regulation (EC) No 852/2004 may be***

applied to slaughterhouses.

Justification

In the interests of simpler administration, the procedures laid down in this Regulation need to be combined with other, similar, procedures in the Hygiene Package.

Amendment 35

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 6 – paragraph 3**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3. The standard operating procedures shall be made available to the competent authority upon request.

3. The standard operating procedures shall be made available to the competent authority upon request. ***The official veterinarian shall be notified in writing whenever standard operating procedures have changed.***

Amendment 36

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 6 – paragraph 3 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3a. the competent authority may amend standard operating procedures when they are clearly not in line with the general, rules and requirements laid down in this regulation.

Justification

This must be a mechanism whereby the competent authority can require the operator to amend SOPs that are clearly inadequate

Amendment 37

Proposal for a regulation
Article 7 – paragraph 2 – point a

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

a) ***the handling and care*** of animals ***before they are restrained***;

a) ***driving*** of animals ***for the purposes of restraint, stunning or slaughter***;

Amendment 38

Proposal for a regulation
Article 7 – paragraph 2 – point f

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

f) the bleeding of live animals.

f) the bleeding of live animals ***and/or the slaughter methods referred to in Article 4(2)***.

Amendment 39

Proposal for a regulation
Article 7 – paragraph 2 – point f a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(fa) the slaughter of fur animals

Justification

There is no reason why all personnel involved in the slaughter of animals on fur factory farms should not be subject to the same criteria as those employed in slaughterhouses.

Amendment 40

Proposal for a regulation
Article 7 – paragraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3. The killing of fur animals shall be supervised by a person holding a certificate of competence as referred to in

deleted

Article 18 which corresponds to all the operations carried out under his supervision.

Justification

The purpose of this amendment is to avoid repetition.

Amendment 41

Proposal for a regulation Article 8 – point a

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

a) the **categories** or weights of animals for which the equipment is intended to be used;

a) the **species** or weights of animals for which the equipment is intended to be used;

Justification

'Species' is a more appropriate technical term.

Amendment 42

Proposal for a regulation Article 8 – point c a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ca) maintenance and calibration methods for that equipment.

Amendment 43

Proposal for a regulation Article 9 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2. During slaughter operations, appropriate back-up stunning **equipment** shall be immediately available on-the-spot and used in the case of failure of the stunning equipment initially used.

2. During slaughter operations, **an** appropriate back-up stunning **method** shall be immediately available on-the-spot and used in the case of failure of the stunning equipment initially used. ***Where this back-up stunning method concerns heavy***

installations, mobile equipment will be appropriate.

Justification

Some of the stunning-methods mentioned in annex I do not require equipment but are well suitable as a back-up stunning method.

Amendment 44

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 9 – paragraph 3 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3 a. No animal shall be restrained if the slaughterer responsible for stunning or slaughtering that animal is not ready to do so.

Justification

Restraining could be very stressful for the animal and it is essential that the time spent in the restraining system or box is as short as possible.

Amendment 45

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 10**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

The requirements laid down in Chapters II and III of this Regulation shall be relevant for the purposes of Article 12(2)(a) of Regulation (EC) No 854/2004.

In the course of an inspection of slaughterhouses or establishments which have been, or are to be, approved in third countries for the purpose of being able to export to the European Union in accordance with EU legislation, the Commission experts shall ensure that the live animals referred to in Article 5 have been slaughtered under conditions which, as far as animal welfare is concerned, are at least equivalent to those provided for in this Regulation.

The health certificate accompanying meat imported from a third country shall be

supplemented by an attestation certifying that the above requirement has been met.

Justification

The right side of the latter table contains the prescription foreseen in the current Directive 93/119 which refers to the certification of equivalence on “humane conditions during the slaughter process” to be observed by the approved establishments for import into the Community. To reinforce what has been underlined in recital 32, it would be appropriate, due to the growing importance of meat imports into the Community, to stick to the wording of the Directive, making it immediately available to the operators at any level.

Amendment 46

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 10 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Article 10a

Arrangements for imports from third countries

The Commission shall ensure that meat and meat products from third countries that are intended for consumption in the internal market comply with the provisions of this Regulation.

Justification

Meat production conditions and methods must be in keeping with Community law, with a view to preventing unfair competition between producers.

Amendment 47

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 11 – paragraph 2 – introductory part**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2. For the purposes of this Regulation the competent authority, referred to in **Article 4** of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, shall **approve** for each slaughterhouse:

2. For the purposes of this Regulation the competent authority, referred to in **Article 4** of Regulation (EC) No 853/2004, shall **take into account**, for **the authorisation of** each slaughterhouse, **the**

information provided by the food business operator on:

Amendment 48

Proposal for a regulation

Article 11 – paragraph 2 – point a

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

a) the maximum throughput for each slaughter line;

deleted

Justification

‘Maximum throughput for each slaughter line’ should be deleted because this entails taking into account not only animal welfare, but also other aspects such as the post mortem inspection. For example, Annex I to Regulation 854/2004 (Hygiene Package) specifies that ‘The speed of the slaughter line ... [is] to be such as to allow for proper inspection.’

Amendment 49

Proposal for a regulation

Article 11 – paragraph 2 – point c

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

c) the maximum capacity for each lairage area intended for equidae and animals of the bovine, ovine, caprine and porcine species and poultry and lagomorphs.

c) the maximum capacity for each lairage area intended for equidae and animals of the bovine, ovine, caprine and porcine species and poultry, *ratites* and lagomorphs.

Justification

Ratites have been included, as they are not considered to be poultry under the Hygiene Package regulations.

Amendment 50

Proposal for a regulation
Article 12 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2. Operators shall ensure that animals **that are killed** without stunning are mechanically restrained.

2. Operators shall ensure that, **when applicable and in the case of religious slaughter where animals are slaughtered** without stunning, **they** are mechanically restrained.

Justification

The original wording leaves much open to interpretation. Furthermore, this requirement is not fully implementable in the operational conditions for ritual slaughter of poultry.

Amendment 51

Proposal for a regulation
Article 12 – paragraph 3 – point e

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

e) the use of electric currents that do not stun or kill the animals under controlled circumstances, in particular, any electric current application that does not span the brain.

deleted

Justification

Low-voltage electro-immobilisation after stunning and before bleeding-out can prevent dangerous muscular reflex movements by animals, which cause a large number of accidents at the workplace among slaughtermen.

Amendment 52

Proposal for a regulation
Article 12 – paragraph 3 – point 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

However, points (a) and (b) shall not apply to the shackles used for poultry.

However, points (a) and (b) shall not apply to the shackles used for poultry **and lagomorphs**.

Amendment 53

Proposal for a regulation Article 13 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. Operators shall put in place and implement appropriate monitoring procedures to verify and confirm that animals for slaughter are effectively stunned in the period between the end of the stunning process and the confirmation of death.

Amendment

1. Operators shall put in place and implement appropriate monitoring procedures to verify and confirm that animals for slaughter are effectively stunned in the period between the end of the stunning process and the confirmation of death. ***Animals must be dead before any other potentially painful carcass-dressing procedure is performed or treatment applied.***

Justification

Properly stunned animals should not display signs of sensibility on the bleed rail. Any animal which demonstrates any sign of regaining sensibility must be immediately re-stunned. No slaughter procedure should begin until the animal is dead.

Amendment 54

Proposal for a regulation Article 13 - paragraph 4 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

4 a. Operators of fur farms shall notify the competent authority in advance when animals are to be slaughtered, to enable the Official Veterinarian to check that the requirements set out in this Regulation, and the standard operating procedures, are being observed.

Justification

Most animals on fur farms are slaughtered during a short period as soon as they have completed their first winter's moult. Another period of slaughter usually takes place after the breeding season. So, unlike other slaughter operations that take place throughout the year, slaughter of fur animals occurs during just a small number of days. It is essential that notice is given to the competent authority so that monitoring can take place.

Amendment 55

Proposal for a regulation Article 13 – paragraph 5

Text proposed by the Commission

5. Community **codes of good practices** concerning monitoring procedures in slaughterhouses may be adopted in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 22(2).

Amendment

5. Community **guidelines for the drawing up of procedures and implementation of rules** concerning monitoring procedures in slaughterhouses may be adopted in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 22(2).

Justification

Detailed requirements on what a SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION is do not fall within the scope of this proposal. Perhaps, the acknowledgement of new EU approved stunning methods should be properly evaluated, e.g. approved national third party evaluation bodies.

Amendment 56

Proposal for a regulation Article 13 – paragraph 5 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

5 a. The Official Veterinarian shall regularly verify the above-mentioned monitoring procedures and adherence to the standard operating procedures.

Justification

The role of official veterinarians is essential for the proper application of this Regulation.

Amendment 57

Proposal for a regulation
Article 14 – paragraph -1 (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

- 1. Operators shall be responsible for ensuring compliance with the rules laid down in this Regulation.

Justification

Responsibility for ensuring compliance with the rules should lie with the operator, and should not in any circumstances lie with a particular employee.

Amendment 58

Proposal for a regulation
Article 14 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1. Operators shall designate an animal welfare officer for each slaughterhouse, to be responsible for **ensuring** compliance with the rules laid down in this Regulation in that slaughterhouse. He or she shall report directly to the operator on matters relating to the welfare of the animals.

1. Operators shall designate an animal welfare officer for each slaughterhouse, to be responsible for **supervising** compliance with the rules laid down in this Regulation in that slaughterhouse. He or she shall report directly to the operator on matters relating to the welfare of the animals.

Justification

Responsibility for ensuring compliance with the rules should lie with the operator, and should not in any circumstances lie with a particular employee.

Amendment 59

Proposal for a regulation
Article 14 – paragraph 5

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

5. Paragraphs 1 **and** 4 shall not apply to slaughterhouses slaughtering **less than 1 000** livestock units **of mammals** or 150 000 units of poultry per year.

5. Paragraphs 1 **to** 4 shall not apply to slaughterhouses slaughtering **up to 50** livestock units **per week** or 150 000 units of poultry per year, **using only the slaughterhouse's own staff.**

Amendment 60

Proposal for a regulation Article 15 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1. The competent authority and the operators involved in a depopulation operation shall establish an action plan to ensure compliance with the rules laid down in this Regulation, before the commencement of the operation.

deleted

In particular, the killing methods planned and the corresponding standard operating procedures for ensuring compliance with the rules laid down in this Regulation, shall be included in the contingency plans required under Community legislation on animal health, on the basis of the hypothesis established in the contingency plan concerning the size and the location of suspected outbreaks.

Amendment 61

Proposal for a regulation Article 15 – paragraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3. For the purposes of this Article and in ***exceptional circumstances***, the competent authority may grant derogations from one or more of the provisions of this Regulation where it considers that compliance is likely to affect human health or significantly slow down the process of eradication of a disease.

3. For the purposes of this Article and in ***cases of force majeure***, the competent authority may grant derogations from one or more of the provisions of this Regulation where it considers that compliance is likely to affect human health or significantly slow down the process of eradication of a disease ***or further undermine animal welfare***.

Justification

'Force majeure' provides a precise, legally consolidated basis for non-discriminatory action

by the competent authorities in support of affected breeders. Furthermore, reference also needs to be made to animal welfare, to cover cases in which animals would undergo greater suffering if the regulation's provisions were applied.

Amendment 62

Proposal for a regulation Article 15 – paragraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

4. Within one year from the date of the end of depopulation operation, the competent authority referred to in paragraph 1 shall transmit to the Commission and make publicly available, in particular through the internet, an evaluation report on the results thereof. **deleted**

4. Within one year from the date of the end of depopulation operation, the competent authority referred to in paragraph 1 shall transmit to the Commission and make publicly available, in particular through the internet, an evaluation report on the results thereof.

That report shall include, in particular:

- a) the reasons for the depopulation;**
- b) the number and the species of animals killed;**
- c) the stunning and killing methods used;**
- d) a description of the difficulties encountered and, where appropriate, solutions found to alleviate or minimise the suffering of the animals concerned;**
- e) any derogation granted in accordance with paragraph 3.**

Justification

The Member States automatically send DG Sanco all the information listed in this paragraph when an eradication programme is implemented and animals are killed on health grounds. This paragraph should be deleted to avoid doubling the administrative burden.

Amendment 63

Proposal for a regulation
Article 16

Text proposed by the Commission

In the case of emergency ***killing***, the person in charge of the animals concerned shall take all the necessary measures to kill the animal as soon as possible.

Amendment

In the case of emergency ***slaughter***, the person in charge of the animals concerned shall take all the necessary measures to ***slaughter*** the animal as soon as possible, ***without prejudice to the conditions laid down in Section I, Chapter VI of Annex III to Regulation (EC) No 853/2004 concerning emergency slaughter outside the slaughterhouse.***

Justification

Reconciliation with ‘Hygiene Package’ regulations.

Amendment 64

Proposal for a regulation
Article 17

Text proposed by the Commission

Article 17

Reference centres

1. Each Member State shall appoint a national reference centre (hereinafter referred to as the “reference centre”) to perform the following tasks:

- a) provide scientific and technical expertise relating to the approval of slaughterhouses;***
- b) carry out assessments of new stunning methods;***
- c) actively encourage the development by operators and other interested parties of codes of good practice for the implementation of this Regulation and publish and disseminate such codes, and monitor their application;***
- d) develop guidelines for the competent authority for the purposes of this Regulation;***

Amendment

deleted

e) accredit bodies and entities for the issuance of certificates of competence, as provided for in Article 18;

f) correspond and cooperate with the Commission and other reference centres, in order to share technical and scientific information and best practices as regards the implementation of this Regulation.

2. Within one year from the date of the entry into force of this Regulation, Member States shall submit details of their reference centre to the Commission and the other Member States, and shall make such information publicly available on the internet.

3. Reference centres may be established as a network, made up of separate entities, provided that all the tasks listed in paragraph 1 are allocated for all the relevant activities taking place in the Member States concerned.

Member States may appoint for an entity located outside their own territory to carry out one or more of those tasks.

Amendment 65

Proposal for a regulation

Article 18 – paragraph 1 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

b) delivering certificates of competence attesting the passing of an independent final examination; the subjects of this examination shall be relevant for the categories of animals concerned and correspond to the operations listed in Article 7(2), and the subjects set out in Annex IV;

Amendment

b) that anyone responsible for developing or maintaining the standard operating procedures set out in Article 6 of this Regulation has received appropriate training;

Amendment 66

Proposal for a regulation
Article 18 – paragraph 1 – point c

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

c) approving training programmes of the courses referred to in point (a) and the content and modalities of the examination referred in point (b);

deleted

Amendment 67

Proposal for a regulation
Article 18 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2. The competent authority may delegate the organisation of the courses, the final examination and the issuance of the certificate of competence to a separate body or entity which:

2. 2. The training programmes must be developed and, where applicable, run, by the business itself or by an organisation authorised by the competent authority.

a) has the expertise, staff and equipment necessary to do so;

That business or organisation shall issue the certificates of competence in this field.

b) is independent and free from any conflict of interest as regards the issuance of the certificates of competence;

The competent authority may, where it considers this necessary, develop and run training programmes and issue certificates of competence.

c) is accredited by the reference centre.

The details of such bodies and entities shall be made publicly available, in particular via the internet.

Justification

Since the desire is to maintain the same focus as in the 'Hygiene Package' regulations, training must be the responsibility of the economic operators. Businesses should be granted the possibility of developing and running training programmes whose content has been approved by the competent authority.

Amendment 68

Proposal for a regulation
Article 18 – paragraph 3 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3. Certificates of competence shall indicate for which categories of animals and for which of the operations listed in Article 7(2) or (3) the certificate is valid.

3. Member States shall appoint the responsible competent authority to approve the content of the training programmes referred to in paragraph 2.

Justification

Since the desire is to maintain the same focus as in the ‘Hygiene Package’ regulations, training must be the responsibility of the economic operators. Businesses should be granted the possibility of developing and running training programmes whose content has been approved by the competent authority.

Amendment 69

Proposal for a regulation
Article 18 – paragraph 3 – point 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Certificates of competences shall not be valid for a period exceeding five years.

deleted

Justification

Certificates of competence should remain valid indefinitely rather than only for five years.

Amendment 70

Proposal for a regulation
Article 18 – paragraph 3 – point 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Certificates of *competences* shall *not* be valid for *a* period *exceeding five years*.

Certificates of *competence* shall be valid for *an unlimited* period. *Holders of certificates of competence shall be required to undergo regular training.*

Amendment 71

Proposal for a regulation
Article 24 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

2. Until 31 December 2014, Member States may provide for certificates of competence, as referred to in Article 18, to be issued without examination to persons demonstrating relevant ***uninterrupted*** professional experience of at least ***[ten]*** years.

Amendment

2. Until 31 December 2014, Member States may provide for certificates of competence, as referred to in Article 18, to be issued without examination to persons demonstrating ***appropriate training and*** relevant professional experience of at least ***12 months before the entry into force of the present Regulation.***

Justification

In a transitional measure, appropriate training and experience of at least 12 months offer the necessary guarantees.

Amendment 72

Proposal for a regulation
Article 24 – paragraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2 a. The Commission shall by 1 January 2013 submit a legislative proposal to the European Parliament and the Council on the establishment of conditions and rules on the use of mobile slaughterhouses within the Union, ensuring that all precautions are taken in those mobile units not to compromise animal welfare.

Justification

Mobile abattoirs reduce the stress induced by handling and transport activities on animals prior to slaughtering, and thereby also attenuate the risk for reduced meat quality. For fragile animals as spent laying hens and highly lactating dairy cows, they are an important means to avoid painful transport, often source of fractures or falls. In addition, they provide environmental benefits in terms of reducing environmental degradation.

Amendment 73

Proposal for a regulation

Annex I – Chapter I – Table I – Line No 2 – Category of animals

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Ruminants **up to 10 kg**, poultry and lagomorphs.

Ruminants, poultry and lagomorphs.

Justification

The technique involving the use of the non-penetrative captive bolt pistol is widely used throughout the world (US, Australia, New Zealand, Brazil, etc.). The equipment used has gradually been improved and currently, if it is used properly by trained personnel in line with the manufacturers' specific recommendations, does not raise any particular problems. This is the only method, moreover, which allows the animal's brain to be preserved.

Amendment 74

Proposal for a regulation

Annex I – Chapter I – Table I – Line No 2 – Key parameters - subparagraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Appropriate velocity and diameter of bolt according to animal size and species.

Appropriate velocity and diameter of bolt (**contact plate method**) according to animal size and species.

Amendment 75

Proposal for a regulation

Annex I – chapter I – table 2 – line No 2 – Name

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Head-to-Back electrical **killling**

Head-to-heart or head-to-back electrical **stunning or slaughtering**

Amendment 76

Proposal for a regulation

Annex I – chapter I – table 2 – line No 2 – Category of animals

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

All species *except lambs or piglets of less than 5 kg live weight and cattle.*

All species.

Amendment 77

Proposal for a regulation

Annex I – chapter I – table 3 – line No 2 – Category of animals

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Pigs *and* poultry.

Pigs, poultry *and fur animals.*

Justification

The use of carbon dioxide can ensure both that animal welfare requirements are met and that slaughter costs are kept down.

Amendment 78

Proposal for a regulation

Annex I – Chapter II – Point 7 – paragraph 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Carbon dioxide at concentrations over 30 % shall not be used to stun or slaughter poultry in a slaughterhouse. Such concentrations may only be used to kill surplus chicks or for the purpose of disease control.

Justification

The Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare of the European Food Safety Authority concluded that more than 30% of CO₂ is aversive for poultry and may cause pain and respiratory distress before loss of consciousness. Accordingly, the use of concentrations of CO₂ above 30% should not be permitted on conscious animals in commercial slaughterhouses but only for disease control on farms and killing of surplus chicks. Only one gas mixture containing over 30% of CO₂ has been established by scientific research as being

relatively humane and an exception for this is included in point 7.3. Any other gas mixture with a concentration of CO₂ over 30% must be approved for use under the terms of the Regulation before being used.

CO₂ is not an acceptable method for ducks and geese as, being aquatic birds, they are highly resistant to gassing techniques.

Amendment 79

Proposal for a regulation Annex II – point 2,3

Text proposed by the Commission

2.3. There shall be a waiting pen, ***with a level floor and solid sides***, between the holding pens and the race leading to the point of stunning, to ensure a steady supply of animals for stunning and killing and to avoid animal handlers having to rush animals from the holding pens. The waiting pen shall be so designed that animals cannot be trapped or trampled.

Amendment

2.3. There shall be a waiting pen between the holding pens and the race leading to the point of stunning, to ensure a steady supply of animals for stunning and slaughter and to avoid animal handlers having to rush animals from the holding pens. The waiting pen shall be so designed that animals cannot be trapped or trampled.

Justification

Decisions on the exact architecture and design of a stall and the layout of the boxes should be taken by the authorities on the spot and the operator concerned.

Amendment 80

Proposal for a regulation Annex II – point 3,2

Text proposed by the Commission

3.2. Restraining boxes used in conjunction with a captive bolt shall be fitted with a device that restricts both the lateral and vertical movement of the head of the animal.

Amendment

deleted

Justification

The use of a device that restricts both the lateral and vertical movement of the head may assist the accuracy of the stun under some conditions. However, under others, such as where the size of animals varies, it may be contra-indicated. The Regulation should allow the FBO the freedom to adopt whatever system works under the particular circumstances of the specific slaughterhouse.

Amendment 81

Proposal for a regulation Annex II – point 3,3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3.3. Systems restraining bovine animals by inversion or any unnatural position shall not be used. **deleted**

Justification

This ban is incompatible with, among other things, the provisions allowing the use of slaughter methods prescribed by religious rites.

Amendment 82

Proposal for a regulation Annex II – Point 4.1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

4.1 a. Electrical stunning equipment shall:
a) incorporate an audible or visible device indicating the length of time of its application to an animal;
b) be connected to a device indicating the voltage and the current under load, positioned so as to be clearly visible to the operator.

Justification

These provisions are in the current Directive but are excluded from the proposed Regulation. They are helpful in ensuring that the stunning operator knows for how long the apparatus has been applied and what voltage and current are being used. Accordingly they should be

included in the Regulation.

Amendment 83

Proposal for a regulation Annex II – point 4,2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

4.2. Electrical apparatus shall deliver a constant current.

deleted

Amendment 84

Proposal for a regulation Annex II – point 7.2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

7.2. Facilities for poultry shall be designed and built so that animals are only conveyed into the gas mixtures in transport crates without being unloaded.

7.2. Live poultry should be conveyed into the gas mixtures either in their transport crates or on conveyor belts.

Justification

This measure is in contradiction with systems that are currently used and that have shown (scientifically based) positive effects on animal welfare. Incorporating this provision would be to the detriment of these animal welfare friendly stunning systems and the business operators that have invested in such installations. The proposed text corresponds with the OIE Terrestrial Code that says: "live poultry should be conveyed into the gas mixtures either in their transport crates or conveyor belts".

Amendment 85

Proposal for a regulation Annex III – point 1,2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1.2. Animals must be unloaded as quickly as possible after arrival and subsequently slaughtered without undue delay.

deleted

In the case of poultry or lagomorphs, the

total time of transport added to the time spent between unloading and slaughter shall not exceed 12 hours.

In the case of mammals, except lagomorphs, the total time of transport added to the time spent between unloading and slaughter shall not exceed:

- a) 19 hours for unweaned animals;*
- b) 24 hours for equidae and pigs;*
- c) 29 hours for ruminants.*

After the expiry of those time limits, the animals must be lairaged, fed, and subsequently given moderate amounts of food at appropriate intervals. In such cases, the animals shall be provided an appropriate amount of bedding or equivalent material which guarantees a level of comfort appropriate to the species and the number of animals concerned. This material must ensure adequate absorption of urine and faeces.

Amendment 86

Proposal for a regulation Annex III – point 1,5

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

For the purpose of slaughter, unweaned animals, lactating dairy animals, females having given birth during the journey or animals delivered in containers shall be given priority over other types of animal. If this is not possible, arrangements shall be made so as to relieve them from their suffering, in particular by:

deleted

- a) milking dairy animals at intervals of not more than 12 hours;*
- b) providing appropriate conditions for suckling and the welfare of the newborn animal in the case of a female having given birth;*

c) providing water in the case of animals delivered in containers.

Justification

Since the transport of animals in these conditions contravenes the regulations in force, this aspect should not be included in a proposal concerning slaughter.

Amendment 87

**Proposal for a regulation
Annex III – point 1.7 – point c**

Text proposed by the Commission

c) lift or drag the animals by the head, ears, horns, legs, tail or fleece, or handle them in such a way as to cause them avoidable pain or suffering;

Amendment

c) lift or drag the animals by the head, ears, horns, legs (***with the exception of the feet of poultry and lagomorphs***), tail or fleece, or handle them in such a way as to cause them avoidable pain or suffering;

Justification

Poultry and rabbits are usually caught by the legs and held by the feet. It is practically not feasible to catch poultry in a different way under the existing technology.

Amendment 88

**Proposal for a regulation
Annex III – Point 1.8 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1.8 a.. Electrical stunning equipment must not be used as a means of restraint or immobilisation or to make animals move.

Justification

This provision is included in the current Directive (Annex B, point 4) but is excluded from the proposed Regulation. It is helpful in preventing abuse of electrical stunning equipment and accordingly should be included in the Regulation.

Amendment 89

Proposal for a regulation Annex III – Point 1.8 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1.8 b. Animals which are unable to walk must not be dragged to the place of slaughter, but must be slaughtered where they lie.

Justification

Substantial suffering is caused when animals that are unable to walk are dragged to the place of slaughter. They should be killed where they lie without being moved. A similar provision is included in the current Directive but has been omitted from the proposed Regulation.

Amendment 90

Proposal for a regulation Annex III – point 2,1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2.1. Each animal shall have enough space to stand up, lie down and turn around.

2.1. Except in the case of large bovine animals kept in individual pens for a period which does not exceed a reasonable limit, each animal shall have enough space to stand up, lie down and turn around.

Justification

Keeping large bovine animals in pens in accordance with the rules currently in force makes it possible to ensure that they are not jostled and remain protected. This is not detrimental to their welfare provided the period for which they are penned does not exceed reasonable limits.

Amendment 91

Proposal for a regulation Annex III – Section 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Captive bolt stunning

2 a.1. The captive bolt must be positioned so as to ensure that the projectile enters the cerebral cortex. In particular, the shooting of cattle in the poll position shall be prohibited. Sheep and goats may be shot in the poll position if the presence of horns prevents use of the crown position. In such cases the shot must be placed immediately behind the base of the horns and aimed towards the mouth, and bleeding must commence within 15 seconds of shooting.

2 a.2. When using a captive bolt instrument, the operator must check to ensure that the bolt retracts to its full extent after each shot. If it does not so retract, the instrument must not be used again until it has been repaired.

Justification

These provisions are in the current Directive but are excluded from the proposed Regulation. They are helpful in ensuring that captive bolt stunning is carried out effectively and accordingly should be included in the Regulation.

Amendment 92

Proposal for a regulation Annex III – Point 2 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Restraint of animals

An animal shall not be placed in a stunning box nor shall its head be placed in a device to restrict its movement unless the person who is to stun the animal is ready to do so as soon as the animal is

placed in the stunning box or its head is fastened.

Justification

Restraint can be very stressful for the animal, and it is essential that the time spent in the restraining system or box is as short as possible.

Amendment 93

**Proposal for a regulation
Annex III – point 3,1**

Text proposed by the Commission

3.1. Where one person is responsible for the stunning, shackling, hoisting and bleeding of animals, that person must carry out all those operations consecutively on one animal before carrying out any of them on another animal.

Amendment

3.1. Where one person is responsible for the stunning, shackling, hoisting and bleeding of animals, that person must carry out all those operations consecutively on one animal before carrying out any of them on another animal. ***This requirement shall not apply when group stunning is used.***

Justification

This requirement is not practical for plants with group stunning or relatively low speed plants where the stunning is performed in one step. The procedure which allows for the shortest stun-stick interval is significantly better.

Amendment 94

**Proposal for a regulation
Annex III – Point 3.1 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3.1 a. Bleeding must be started without delay after stunning and be carried out in such a way as to bring about rapid, profuse and complete bleeding.

Justification

It is essential that bleeding is performed without delay after stunning to reduce the danger of animals regaining consciousness before death. This provision is included in the current Directive but it has been excluded from the proposed Regulation. The proposed amendment

restores this provision.

Amendment 95

Proposal for a regulation Annex III – Point 3.2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3.2 a. After incision of the blood vessels, no further dressing procedures nor any electrical stimulation may be performed on the animals before the bleeding has ended and, in any event, not before the expiry of—

- a) in the case of a turkey or goose, a period of not less than 120 seconds;***
- b) in the case of any other bird, a period of not less than 90 seconds;***
- c) in the case of stunned bovine animals, a period of not less than 30 seconds;***
- d) in the case of bovine animals that have not been stunned, a period of not less than 120 seconds;***
- e) in the case of sheep, goats, pigs and deer, a period of not less than 20 seconds.***

Justification

It is important that dressing procedures and electrical stimulation are not performed on animals until they are dead. The current Directive includes such a provision but it has been excluded from the proposed Regulation. The proposed amendment restores this provision. Most of the detailed figures are based on UK legislation.

Amendment 96

Proposal for a regulation Annex III – point 3.3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3.3. Birds shall not be slaughtered by means of automatic neck cutters unless it can be ascertained whether or not the neck cutters have effectively severed the blood

3.3. Birds shall not be slaughtered by means of automatic neck cutters unless it can be ascertained whether or not the neck cutters have effectively severed the blood

vessels. When neck cutters have not been effective the bird shall be **killed** immediately.

vessels. When neck cutters have not been effective the bird shall be **slaughtered** immediately.

Justification

The animals will still be intended for human consumption.

Amendment 97

**Proposal for a regulation
Annex IV – point (f a) (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

f a.) the killing of fur animals

Practical aspects of handling and restraining animals.

Practical aspects of stunning techniques.

Back-up stunning and/or slaughter methods.

Maintenance of stunning and/or slaughter equipment.

Monitoring the effectiveness of stunning.

Justification

It is important to specify the operations in which those involved in killing animals on fur farms must be competent.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Current situation

Every year in the European Union, 360 million pigs, cattle, sheep and goats, as well as more than 4 billion poultry, are killed. In addition, the European fur industry kills 25 million animals, while hatcheries kill 330 million day old chicks. The control of contagious diseases may also require the killing of millions of animals.

Many farm animals are subject to treatment which involves unnecessary suffering, not only during their rearing and transport, but also at the time of slaughter or killing and related operations. There are growing concerns for improving animal welfare in European society among consumers and producers.

Animal welfare protection at the time of slaughter or killing or during related processes is governed by Directive 92/119/EC. At present, the Member States of the European Union are implementing the provisions of that directive to differing degrees. This has led to concerns regarding the need to ensure animal welfare and has had adverse effects on competition among operators in the internal market. In addition, new legislation was adopted in 2004 with the 'hygiene package', which made operators responsible for the quality of foodstuffs.

Since it came into force, Directive 93/119/EC has not been amended, although in the meantime there have been technological advances in methods of stunning, slaughter and killing of animals.

Aim and scope of the Commission proposal

The main aim of the Commission proposal is to improve animal welfare during the killing of farm animals intended for consumption, fur animals, and animals slaughtered in the event of the outbreak of contagious diseases, other threats to public health, or on environmental grounds. The Commission proposal also seeks to promote innovation in methods of stunning, slaughter and killing and to improve harmonisation in the internal market.

One of the main changes in the proposed legislation is the switch from a directive to a regulation as the legal basis, allowing for improved harmonisation of the Member States' laws, enhancing competition in the internal market and speeding up the adoption of new methods of stunning, slaughter and killing. The new legislation makes operators responsible for animal welfare, at the same time giving them greater flexibility in implementing new standards in this area. Operators are required to develop and implement standard operating procedures, appoint an animal welfare officer, ensure that workers responsible for killing and related operations are properly qualified by requiring them to undergo training and obtain certificates of competence, and carry out checks and monitoring of the effectiveness of stunning processes. Provision is made for derogations for small operators. The proposal makes provision for the operators' activities to be monitored and authorised by the competent authorities of the Member States. The proposal provides for the setting up of national reference centres to provide scientific and technical expertise relating to animal welfare, carry out assessments of new stunning methods and provide support for the implementation of the regulation.

The proposal includes a list of methods for the stunning and killing of animals, together with detailed information regarding specifications and requirements. The new concept of animal

welfare protection at time of slaughter incorporates the basic principle that animals should be stunned when they are killed.

The proposal requires producers of equipment for the restraining and stunning of animals to provide instructions for the use and maintenance of such equipment in order to ensure optimum animal welfare conditions during its use.

Bearing in mind the basic rights of citizens, the Commission proposal provides for derogations for cases in which animals are slaughtered in accordance with religious rites.

Rapporteur's position

The rapporteur welcomes the Commission proposal and is pleased that it is meeting the challenge of raising animal welfare standards at the time of slaughter or killing and during related processes. The proposal is consistent with the aims and principles of the Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals and the Animal Health Strategy.

The rapporteur believes that the large-scale slaughter of animals should be carried out with due regard for the highest possible humanitarian standards, limiting as far as possible the physical and mental suffering experienced by animals and seeking to eliminate unnecessary cruelty.

Limiting the suffering of animals for slaughter should be seen as an important cultural and moral challenge to European civilisation, bearing in mind the principle that animals are sentient beings capable of feeling pain and fear and cannot be treated as objects. In a civilised European culture we cannot remain indifferent to the suffering of animals.

The introduction of a regulation seeking to reduce the suffering of slaughtered animals is a welcome initiative. The existing EU provisions from 1993 are in the form of a directive and are inadequate since they fail to ensure a uniform approach throughout the European Union and in individual Member States. The proposal to replace them by a new and directly applicable regulation is fully justified. The regulation concerns protection at the time of killing or slaughter of farm animals for the production of food, wool, skin, fur or other products. It does not cover the killing of animals performed as part of hunting, cultural or sporting activities, performed by veterinarians in the framework of their medical practice, or the killing of poultry and lagomorphs slaughtered outside of a slaughterhouse by their owner for his or her personal consumption. While the justification for such exemptions can be recognised, there is a need for separate regulation by means of a directive for the killing of animals other than farm animals for economic purposes. Such regulation should also cover the killing of animals used for experiments and others mentioned above, as well as domestic and stray animals. The killing of such animals should take account as far as possible of the need to minimise suffering. The rapporteur calls on the Commission to draw up an appropriate directive in this area.

The rapporteur fully supports the establishment of a general rule that animals should be spared all unnecessary pain, anxiety or suffering at the time of killing and related operations. He urges that the measures be taken that will ensure compliance with this rule.

The rapporteur believes that it is right to stipulate that methods of killing must result in the immediate death or stunning of the animals concerned.

The rapporteur recognises the problem posed by ritual slaughter, which for religious reasons

does not allow animals to be rendered unconscious before killing. An appropriate solution would be to leave it to the national legislators to rule on the inadmissibility of ritual slaughter. At the same time, there is a need for dialogue with religious communities practising ritual slaughter with a view to taking possible measures to reduce the suffering of animals killed in this way.

It should be pointed out that meat from animals killed by ritual slaughter to a large extent finds its way to consumers who do not belong to the communities which practise this kind of killing. In this connection, Parliament favours introducing the principle that meat originating from ritual slaughter must be appropriately labelled so as to inform consumers, who must be in a position to choose whether or not they wish to eat meat from animals slaughtered without first being rendered unconscious.

The rapporteur recognises that, apart from exemptions on religious grounds, the basic method of slaughter and killing of animals within the territory of the European Union must be prior stunning performed in a way that is fully effective and controlled.

The rapporteur acknowledges that it is appropriate to introduce standard operating procedures for the killing of animals and related operations. These procedures must take account of producers' recommendations and determine the most important parameters for the stunning methods used.

The rapporteur believes it is appropriate to introduce the requirement that all processes related to the preparation and carrying out of the killing of animals should be performed by persons with suitable qualifications obtained through the proper training. It is also vital to require that equipment for the killing and prior restraint of animals should be accompanied by the relevant manufacturers' instructions and that these instructions should be closely observed when the equipment is used.

It is also right to ban methods for the restraint of animals prior to killing which are cruel or which increase their suffering, including the suspending or hoisting of animals by their feet or legs.

The rapporteur supports the introduction of a requirement for procedures to monitor the effective stunning of animals prior to killing, and the need to assign responsibility for these procedures to specific persons.

It is particularly important that, for each large slaughterhouse slaughtering at least 1000 livestock units or 150 000 units of poultry per year, an animal welfare officer should be designated to be responsible for ensuring compliance with the rules laid down in the regulation. However, the conditions of employment of the official by the slaughterhouse operator must include assurances that will protect his position from possible pressure to neglect the responsibilities of his post. The detailed provisions governing the status of this official must clearly specify that his role is not a token one. At the same time, for smaller slaughterhouses which are not required to employ an official of this kind, it must be clearly specified that the slaughterhouse owner is responsible for ensuring that the rules on animal welfare are enforced.

The rapporteur welcomes the introduction of provisions for cases where depopulation may be necessary in order to combat outbreaks of disease. It is vital that the depopulation should be carried out in accordance with an appropriate plan of action geared to actual needs. At the same time, depopulation must always be restricted to what is scientifically justified and must also be conducted in such a way as to keep animal suffering to a minimum.

Where animals have to be killed as a necessity, this must be done as swiftly as possible to avoid prolonging the suffering of the animals concerned.

Of particular importance is the establishment of national reference centres responsible for the measures necessary to ensure that the killing and slaughter of animals is carried out properly, including carrying out assessments of stunning methods and accrediting bodies and entities for the issuing of certificates of competence. Parliament views the role of these reference centres as key and does not want to see it assigned as yet another task for existing institutions such as veterinary inspection. These centres should be bodies which operate independently. They could also be given appropriate supervisory powers as regards the implementation of provisions on the slaughter and killing of animals.

The rapporteur welcomes the proposed procedure for obtaining a certificate of competence for operations related to the slaughter and killing of animals.

He also accepts the proposed provisions on non-compliance, particularly the possibility for the competent authorities to stop production. However, this should be closely related to the right to perform controls.

The rapporteur accepts the need for appropriate penalties for infringement of the rules on the slaughter and killing of animals, while pointing out that they should be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

While supporting the directive, the rapporteur would point out at the same time that the increase in the requirements relating to the slaughter and killing of animals will lead to an increase in costs (compliance with relevant technical requirements, training, additional staff, etc.). The problem of costs may be a barrier to the implementation of the directive's provisions. The Commission makes no provision for EU budget expenditure for this purpose and places the entire financial burden on the Member States and economic operators. It is to be feared that this financial system will not prove effective. If the protection of animals at the time of killing is to be compulsory under European law as a result of the directive, the Union should also provide a financial contribution to the implementation of these provisions. Funding from the Community budget should be made available in particular for actions to promote new methods, training of staff, assistance with the drawing up of appropriate procedures, and so on.

Attention should also be drawn to the question of competition. Increased costs deriving from higher standards of animal protection at the time of killing could weaken Europe's competitiveness in the meat sector. Efforts should therefore be made to establish appropriate standards for imports to the EU market. Products of animal origin imported into the EU market should be permissible only from operators who comply with standards which are the same as or similar to those laid down in this directive.

2.2.2009

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 regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing
(COM(2008)0553 – C6-0451/2008 – 2008/0180(CNS))

Rapporteur: Jens Holm

SHORT JUSTIFICATION

Every year millions of animals, such as pigs, sheep, goats and cattle are killed in EU slaughterhouses. In addition, four million poultry are killed yearly in the EU.

Many of these animals endure serious suffering, not only during transport to the slaughterhouses but also at the time of killing. The European Union has an obligation to enforce fundamental changes to minimize this suffering, bearing in mind that a great number of the EU citizens demand increased animal welfare protection standards.

Cutting meat consumption would be the most obvious way to minimize the suffering endured by millions of animals and thereby putting an end to this extensive killing of animals. This should be a matter of high priority, with a view to bringing about some prompt changes. Unfortunately, it is highly unlikely that meat consumption will cease in the near future. It is therefore essential that the suffering of animals at the time of slaughter be reduced to a minimum level.

As your draftsman, I therefore welcome the Commission proposal for a revision of Directive 93/119/EC. The proposed Regulation imposes the same minimum rules on the treatment of animals at the time of slaughter in the whole of the EU. It is important to point out that the operators bear the responsibility for ensuring animal welfare, to reduce distress and suffering at the time of killing to a minimum level.

Your draftsman is, however, of the opinion that the Commission proposal needs some improvement. The establishment and use of mobile slaughterhouses should be encouraged. This can be an efficient way of reducing the need for animals to be transported over long distances across Europe and thereby eliminating the stress animals are forced to endure during such long transports. Such mobile slaughterhouses are commonly used in Norway. The EU should be able to follow on from the experience made in Norway.

The Commission Regulation requires all slaughterhouses to appoint official animal welfare protection inspectors, which requires operators to take real ownership of animal welfare enforcement. This inspector cannot and should not, however, replace the normal controls and inspections which are conducted by the national authorities in each Member State. Based on experience in the Member States, such controls and inspections rather need to be more frequent and improved. A possible method of financing the inspections would be for the industry to contribute with a small fee based on every kilo meat that is produced.

Your draftsman would furthermore like to underline that it is crucial that the proposed national centres of reference operate independently, as these centres should provide expertise and technical expertise on animal welfare issues.

It has to be made clear that the proposed Regulation only lays down minimum rules. Individual Member States should not only be allowed to apply higher animal welfare standards but should be encouraged to do so. Higher standards could encourage a gradual improvement of animal welfare protection, at the same time as reducing to an absolute minimum the suffering of animals before and at the time of killing..

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:

Amendment 1

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 6

Text proposed by the Commission

(6) The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has adopted two opinions on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing of certain species of animals, namely on the Welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing the main commercial species of animals, in 2004 and on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing applied to commercially farmed deer, goats, rabbits, ostriches, ducks, geese and quail, in 2006. Community legislation in this area should be updated to take into

Amendment

(6) The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has adopted two opinions on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing of certain species of animals, namely on the Welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing the main commercial species of animals, in 2004 and on the welfare aspects of the main systems of stunning and killing applied to commercially farmed deer, goats, rabbits, ostriches, ducks, geese and quail, in 2006. ***In 2001 the Scientific Committee on the Animal Health and***

account those scientific opinions. Recommendations to phase out the use of carbon dioxide for pigs and poultry, as well as to phase out the use of waterbath stunners for poultry were not included in the proposal because the impact assessment revealed that they were not economically viable at present in the EU. Furthermore other recommendations should not be part of this Regulation because they refer to technical parameters that should be part of implementing measures or codes of good practices. Recommendations on farm fish were not included in the proposal because there was a need for further scientific opinion and economic evaluation in this field.

Animal Welfare (SCAHAW) adopted a report on The Welfare of Animals Kept for Fur Production which included a review of the killing methods used in fur factory farms. Community legislation in this area should be updated to take into account those scientific opinions. Recommendations to phase out the use of carbon dioxide for pigs and poultry, as well as to phase out the use of waterbath stunners for poultry were not included in the proposal because the impact assessment revealed that they were not economically viable at present in the EU. Furthermore other recommendations should not be part of this Regulation because they refer to technical parameters that should be part of implementing measures or codes of good practices. Recommendations on farm fish were not included in the proposal because there was a need for further scientific opinion and economic evaluation in this field.

Justification

The SCAHAW review contains important information relevant to the killing of animals on fur farms within the EU.

Amendment 2

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 11

Text proposed by the Commission

(11) Fish present substantial physiological differences from terrestrial animals and farmed fish are slaughtered and killed in a very different context, in particular as regards the inspection process. Furthermore, research on the stunning of fish is far less developed than for other farmed species. Separate standards should be established on the protection of fish at killing. Therefore, provisions applicable to fish should at present be limited to the key principle. Further initiatives should

Amendment

(11) Fish present substantial physiological differences from terrestrial animals and farmed fish are slaughtered and killed in a very different context, in particular as regards the inspection process. Furthermore, research on the stunning of fish is far less developed than for other farmed species. Separate standards should, **however**, be established on the protection of fish at killing **within five years after entry into force of this Regulation**. Therefore, provisions applicable to fish

consider legislative or non legislative options and may be taken by the Community based on a scientific risk assessment for the slaughter and killing of fish performed by the European Food Safety Authority and taking into account the social, economic and administrative implications.

should **until then** be limited to the key principle. **These** further initiatives should consider legislative or non legislative options and may be taken by the Community based on a scientific risk assessment for the slaughter and killing of fish performed by the European Food Safety Authority and taking into account the social, economic and administrative implications.

Justification

For a lot of farmed fish it is not yet clear which the most appropriate slaughter method is. There is, however, scientific evidence (EFSA report from 15th of June 2004) that some methods are causing negative welfare effects to the fish, such as stress and aversion, which involve the fish taking a long time to lose consciousness.

Amendment 3

Proposal for a regulation Recital 14

Text proposed by the Commission

14. Hunting activities take place in a context where conditions of killing are very different from the ones used for farmed animals and hunting is subject to specific legislations. ***It is therefore appropriate to exclude killings*** taking place during hunting from the scope of this Regulation.

Amendment

14. Hunting activities take place in a context where conditions of killing are very different from the ones used for farmed animals and hunting is subject to specific ***national*** legislations. ***Killings*** taking place during hunting ***should therefore be excluded*** from the scope of this Regulation ***and be governed by Member States' national legislation instead.***

Justification

Hunting falls within the Member States' sphere of competence and is adequately covered by national legislation.

Amendment 4

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 24

Text proposed by the Commission

(24) Depending on how they are used during the slaughtering or killing process, some stunning methods can lead to death while avoiding pain and minimising distress or suffering for the animals.

Consequently, it is not necessary to make a distinction between reversible and non-reversible methods of stunning.

Amendment

(24) Depending on how they are used during the slaughtering or killing process, some stunning methods can lead to death while avoiding pain and minimising distress or suffering for the animals.

Justification

Some gassing methods used to stun/ kill animals for their fur are reversible and the animals regain consciousness. Since there is no further step in the killing process e.g. exsanguination it is possible that the animals could go on to be skinned while still conscious.

Amendment 5

Proposal for a regulation
Recital 27

Text proposed by the Commission

(27) Well trained and skilled personnel improve the conditions under which animals are treated. Competence with regards to animal welfare implies knowledge of the basic behavioural patterns and the needs of the species concerned as well as signs of consciousness and sensibility. It also includes technical expertise with regard to the stunning equipment used. Personnel killing animals for human consumption and ***people supervising the seasonal killing of fur animals*** should therefore be required to have a certificate of competence relevant to the operations they perform. ***Requiring a certificate of competence for other personnel killing animals would, however, be disproportionate to the aims pursued.***

Amendment

(27) Well trained and skilled personnel improve the conditions under which animals are treated. Competence with regards to animal welfare implies knowledge of the basic behavioural patterns and the needs of the species concerned as well as signs of consciousness and sensibility. It also includes technical expertise with regard to the stunning equipment used. Personnel killing animals for human consumption and ***fur production*** should therefore be required to have a certificate of competence relevant to the operations they perform.

Justification

There is no reason to exempt staff working in fur farms from the need to have certificate of competence.

Amendment 6

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 36

Text proposed by the Commission

(36) Guidelines are necessary to provide operators and the competent authorities with specific information on the construction, layout and equipment of slaughterhouses in order to ensure a high level of protection for animals, while maintaining a level playing field for operators. It is therefore necessary that the Community authorises the Commission for adopting such guidelines.

Amendment

(36) Guidelines are necessary to provide operators and the competent authorities with specific information on the construction, layout and equipment of slaughterhouses **and fur factory farms** in order to ensure a high level of protection for animals, while maintaining a level playing field for operators. It is therefore necessary that the Community authorises the Commission for adopting such guidelines.

Justification

It would be inconsistent to exempt fur factory farms from this provision.

Amendment 7

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 37

Text proposed by the Commission

(37) Killing without stunning requires an accurate cut of the throat to minimise suffering. In addition, animals that are not mechanically restrained after the cut are likely to slow down the bleeding process, thereby prolonging unnecessarily the suffering of the animals. Animals slaughtered without stunning should therefore be individually restrained.

Amendment

(37) Killing without stunning requires an accurate cut of the throat to minimise suffering. In addition, animals that are not mechanically restrained after the cut are likely to slow down the bleeding process, thereby prolonging unnecessarily the suffering of the animals. Animals slaughtered without stunning should therefore be individually restrained **and receive effective stunning immediately after the cut.**

Justification

Consideration to religious slaughter is of course needed. However, in order to protect the animals from unnecessary suffering the basic requirement of post-stunning must apply.

Amendment 8

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 38

Text proposed by the Commission

(38) Science and technical progress are regularly made with regard to the handling and restraining of animals at slaughterhouses. It is therefore important that the Community authorises the Commission for amending the requirements applicable to the handling and restraining of animals before **slaughter** while keeping a uniform and high level of protection for animals.

Amendment

(38) Science and technical progress are regularly made with regard to the handling and restraining of animals at slaughterhouses **and fur factory farms**. It is therefore important that the Community authorises the Commission for amending the requirements applicable to the handling and restraining of animals before **killing** while keeping a uniform and high level of protection for animals.

Justification

It would be inconsistent to exempt fur factory farms from this provision. The term 'slaughter' is defined in the Regulation as 'the killing of animals for human consumption' and would, therefore, exclude animals killed on fur factory farms from this provision.

Amendment 9

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 39

Text proposed by the Commission

(39) Guidelines are necessary to provide operators and competent authorities with specific information on the handling and restraining of animals before **slaughter** in order to ensure a high level of protection for the animals, while maintaining a level playing field for operators. It is therefore necessary that the Community authorises the Commission for adopting such guidelines.

Amendment

(39) Guidelines are necessary to provide operators and competent authorities with specific information on the handling and restraining of animals before **killing** in order to ensure a high level of protection for the animals, while maintaining a level playing field for operators. It is therefore necessary that the Community authorises the Commission for adopting such guidelines.

Justification

See Justification for Amendment 6.

Amendment 10

Proposal for a regulation

Article 1 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

However, as regards fish, only Article 3(1) shall apply.

Amendment

As regards fish, **temporarily** only Article 3(1) shall apply. **However, the Commission shall present, within five years after entry into force of this Regulation, a legislative proposal on standards for the protection of fish at the time of killing.**

Amendment 11

Proposal for a regulation

Article 2 – point b

Text proposed by the Commission

(b) “related operations” means operations such as handling, lairaging, restraining, stunning and bleeding of animals taking place in the context and at the location where they are to be killed;

Amendment

(b) “related operations” means operations such as **unloading**, handling, lairaging, restraining, stunning and bleeding of animals taking place in the context and at the location where they are to be killed;

Justification

The unloading is part of the related operations and should therefore be mentioned in the definition.

Amendment 12

Proposal for a regulation

Article 2 – point f

Text proposed by the Commission

(f) “stunning” means any intentionally induced process which causes loss of

Amendment

(f) “stunning” means any intentionally induced process which causes loss of

consciousness and sensibility without pain, including any process resulting in instantaneous death;

consciousness and sensibility without pain, ***distress or suffering***, including any process resulting in instantaneous death;

Justification

As the notion of pain is subjective, the same wording as for Article 3.1 should apply.

Amendment 13

Proposal for a regulation

Article 2 – point j

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(j) “slaughter” means the killing of animals for human consumption;

(j) “slaughter” means the killing of animals for human consumption ***or fur production***;

Justification

The definition of slaughter excludes fur animals from many of the provisions of the proposal. Animals killed for their fur should be given the same degree of protections as other animals covered by this Regulation.

Amendment 14

Proposal for a regulation

Article 2 – point k

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(k) “slaughterhouse” means any establishment used for slaughtering terrestrial animals;

(k) “slaughterhouse” means any establishment used for slaughtering terrestrial animals ***and animals reared for fur production***;

Justification

The definition of slaughterhouse needs to include the killing of fur animals otherwise they will be excluded from many of the provisions of the proposed Regulation. If the definition is not changed the all of chapter three will not be applicable to fur animals.

Amendment 15

Proposal for a regulation
Article 2 – point m

Text proposed by the Commission

(m) “fur animals” means animals of the mammal species primarily reared for the production of fur such as minks, polecats, foxes, raccoons, coypu and chinchillas;

Amendment

(m) “fur animals” means animals of the mammal species primarily reared for the production of fur such as minks, polecats, foxes, raccoons, **raccoon dogs**, coypu, **rabbits** and chinchillas;

Justification

The addition of two species bred for their fur in the EU helps with consistency.

Amendment 16

Proposal for a regulation
Article 3 – paragraph 3 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3a. Animals shall be subject to particular protection during the period prior to and after giving birth.

Amendment 17

Proposal for a regulation
Article 4 – paragraph 2 - subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2. By way of derogation from paragraph 1, where such methods are prescribed by religious rites, animals may be killed without prior stunning, provided that the killing takes place in a slaughterhouse.

2. By way of derogation from paragraph 1, where such methods are prescribed by religious rites, animals may be killed without prior stunning, provided that the killing takes place in a slaughterhouse **and the animals receive effective stunning immediately after the cut.**

Justification

Consideration to religious slaughter is of course needed. However, in order to protect the animals from unnecessary suffering the basic requirement of post-stunning must apply.

Amendment 18

Proposal for a regulation

Article 5 – paragraph 1 - subparagraph 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

However, Member States may decide to prescribe specific methods of stunning for certain species, which involve less pain or suffering for the animal.

Justification

Certain Member States have more stringent practices regarding stunning methods than foreseen in this proposal for a Regulation. They should be able to continue apply these practices.

Amendment 19

Proposal for a regulation

Article 5 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Furthermore, the technique of electrical waterbaths for poultry shall be prohibited within the Community by 1 January 2014.

Justification

Given the serious welfare concern expressed by EFSA regarding water bath electrical stunning, this method must be phased out.

Amendment 20

Proposal for a regulation

Article 5 – paragraph 3 – subparagraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3. Annex I may be amended in accordance with the procedure referred to in Article 22(2) to take account of scientific and

3. Annex I may be amended in accordance with the ***regulatory*** procedure ***with scrutiny*** referred to in Article 22(2***a***) to take account of scientific and technical

technical progress.

progress.

Amendment 21

Proposal for a regulation

Article 7 – paragraph 2 – point f a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(fa) the killing of fur animals

The adoption of this amendment requires the deletion of Art. 7(3) of the Commission proposal.

Justification

There is no reason why all personnel involved in killing animals on fur factory farms should not be subject to the same criteria as those employed in slaughterhouses.

Amendment 22

Proposal for a regulation

Article 7 – paragraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

3. The killing of fur animals shall be supervised by a person holding a certificate of competence as referred to in Article 18 which corresponds to all the operations carried out under his supervision.

deleted

Justification

There is no reason to exempt staff working in fur farms from the need to have certificate of competence.

Amendment 23

Proposal for a regulation
Article 11 – paragraph 2 – point a

Text proposed by the Commission

(a) the maximum throughput for each slaughter line;

Amendment

(a) the maximum throughput for each slaughter line **and fur factory farm**;

Justification

Animals on fur factory farms are killed during a short ‘batch’ period as soon as they have completed their first winter’s moult so many thousands of animals may be killed over a short number of days. It is essential to place a maximum rate of killing on this type of operation to avoid shortcuts and poor welfare.

Amendment 24

Proposal for a regulation
Article 12 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Member States may decide to apply stricter rules than the ones set out in Annex III.

Justification

Certain Member States have stricter operational rules than foreseen in this proposal for a Regulation. They should be able to continue to apply these rules.

Amendment 25

Proposal for a regulation
Article 13 – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

Operators shall verify and confirm that animals slaughtered without prior stunning are effectively post-stunned immediately after the cut and until the confirmation of death.

Justification

Consideration to religious slaughter is of course needed. However, in order to protect the animals from unnecessary suffering the basic requirement of post-stunning must apply.

Amendment 26

Proposal for a regulation

Article 13 – paragraph 4 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

4a. The correct implementation of the above monitoring procedures shall be regularly checked daily by the official veterinarian and appropriate records kept. The welfare checks shall also include a control of the welfare indicators and key parameters described in the standard operating procedures.

Justification

The Commission proposal makes no reference to the monitoring role of the Official Veterinarian (OV) as it is already covered by the 854/2004 regulation laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption. However, the role of the OV in the enforcement of this Regulation is essential and must therefore be explicitly stressed.

Amendment 27

Proposal for a regulation

Article 13 – paragraph 5 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

5a. Operators of fur farms shall notify the competent authority in advance when animals are to be killed to enable monitoring to take place.

Justification

Most animals on fur factory farms are killed during a short 'batch' period as soon as they have completed their first winter's moult. Another period of killing usually takes place after the breeding season. So, unlike other slaughter operations that take place throughout the

year, killing of fur animals occurs during a short number of days. It is essential that notice is given to the competent authority so that monitoring can take place.

Amendment 28

Proposal for a regulation

Article 17 – paragraph 1 – introductory part

Text proposed by the Commission

1. Each Member State shall appoint a national reference centre (hereinafter referred to as the “reference centre”) to perform the following tasks:

Amendment

1. Each Member State shall appoint a national reference centre (hereinafter referred to as the “reference centre”), ***constituted by independent scientists and other experts in animal welfare science***, to perform the following tasks:

Justification

Independency and competence must be safeguarded.

Amendment 29

Proposal for a regulation

Article 17 – paragraph 1 – point f a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(fa) if an operator decides to operate a process with parameters that are not following the published guidelines or codes of good practices, those parameters must be preassessed.

Justification

Effective enforcement measures must be introduced.

Amendment 30

Proposal for a regulation

Article 19 – point a

Text proposed by the Commission

(a) ***request*** operators to amend their

Amendment

(a) ***require*** operators to amend their

standard operating procedures and in particular slow down or stop production;

standard operating procedures and in particular slow down or stop production;

Justification

Effective enforcement measures must be introduced.

Amendment 31

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 22 – paragraph 2 a (new)**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2a. Where reference is made to this paragraph, Article 5a (1) to (4) and Article 7 of Decision 1999/468/EC shall apply, having regard to the provisions of Article 8 thereof.

Amendment 32

**Proposal for a regulation
Article 24 – paragraph 1**

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1. Until 31 December 2018, Article 11(1) shall only apply to new slaughterhouses or for any new construction, layout ***or equipment*** covered by the rules set out in Annex II, which have not entered into operation before the date of [application/entry into force] of this Regulation.

1. Until 31 December 2018, Article 11(1) shall only apply to new slaughterhouses or for any new construction ***or*** layout covered by the rules set out in Annex II, which have not entered into operation before the date of [application/entry into force] of this Regulation.

Justification

There is no need for equipment (e.g. Electrical stunning equipment referred to in Annex II (4)) to have the same derogation as construction.

Amendment 33

Proposal for a regulation
Article 24 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

2. Until 31 December 2014, Member States may provide for certificates of competence, as referred to in Article 18, to be issued **without** examination to persons demonstrating relevant uninterrupted professional experience of at least [ten] years.

Amendment

2. Until 31 December 2014, Member States may provide for certificates of competence, as referred to in Article 18, to be issued **following a simplified** examination to persons demonstrating relevant uninterrupted professional experience of at least [ten] years.

Justification

A period of ‘uninterrupted professional experience of at least [ten] years’ is not a guarantee of competence and could mean that bad practice is actually entrenched. All those involved in killing should be assessed for the spirit of the legislation to be maintained.

Amendment 34

Proposal for a regulation
Article 24 – paragraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2a. The Commission shall by 1 January 2013 submit a legislative proposal to the European Parliament and the Council on the establishment of conditions and rules on the use of mobile slaughterhouses within the Community, ensuring that all precautions are taken in those mobile units not to compromise animal welfare.

Justification

Mobile abattoirs reduce the stress induced by handling and transport activities on animals prior to slaughtering, and thereby also attenuate the risk for reduced meat quality. For fragile animals as spent laying hens and highly lactating dairy cows, they are an important means to avoid painful transport, often source of fractures or falls. In addition, they provide environmental benefits in terms of reducing environmental degradation.

Amendment 35

Proposal for a regulation
Annex I – table 2 – row 2

Text proposed by the Commission

No	Name	Description	Category of animals	Key parameters
2	Head-to-Back electrical killing	Exposure of the body to a current generating at the same time a generalised epileptic form on the EEG (stunning) and the fibrillation or the stopping of the heart (killing).	All species except lambs or piglets of less than 5 kg live weight and cattle.	Minimum current (A or mA) Minimum voltage (V). Maximum frequency (Hz) Minimum time of exposure Frequency of calibration equipment Optimisation of the current Prevention of electrical shock stunning.

Amendment

No	Name	Description	Category of animals	Key parameters
2	Head-to-Back electrical killing	Exposure of the body to a current generating at the same time a generalised epileptic form on the EEG (stunning) and the fibrillation or the stopping of the heart (killing).	All species except lambs, piglets of less than 5 kg live weight, cattle, and fur animals .	Minimum current (A or mA) Minimum voltage (V). Maximum frequency (Hz) Minimum time of exposure Frequency of calibration equipment Optimisation of the current Prevention of electrical shock stunning.

Justification

The evidence is clear that electrocution of conscious foxes is not humane. It has been banned by New York State. Veterinarian Dr Butterworth says: ‘Electrocution requires considerable restraint, and use of electrodes inserted into orifices in some species. If cardiac arrest is induced without first inducing unconsciousness, then there is potential for severe pain and distress. Electrocution equipment presents hazards to the operator.’ The American Veterinary Medical Association disapproves of electrocution in this setting. It says: ‘Techniques that apply electric current from head to tail.....are unacceptable.’ The same concerns arise for ‘ear to tail’ electrocution of chinchillas.

Amendment 36

Proposal for a regulation
Annex I – Chapter I – table 3

Text proposed by the Commission

No	Name	Description	Category of	Key parameters	Specific
----	------	-------------	-------------	----------------	----------

			animals		requirements of Chapter II of this Annex
1	Carbon dioxide at high concentration	Exposure of conscious animals to a gas mixture containing more than 30% carbon dioxide.	Pigs, poultry and fur animals.	Carbon dioxide concentration. Duration of exposure. Maximum stun-to-stick interval (pigs).	Point 6. Point 7 for poultry.
2	Carbon dioxide at low concentration	Exposure of conscious animals to a gas mixture containing less than 30% of carbon dioxide.	Pigs and poultry	Carbon dioxide concentration. Duration of exposure. Maximum stun-to-stick interval in case of stunning (pigs).	Point 7 for poultry.
3	Inert gases	Exposure of conscious animals to an inert gas mixture such as Argon or Nitrogen containing less than 2% of oxygen.	Pigs and poultry.	Oxygen concentration. Duration of exposure. Maximum stun-to-stick interval in case of stunning (pigs).	Point 7 for poultry.
4	Carbon monoxide (pure source)	Exposure of conscious animals to a gas mixture containing more than 4 % of carbon monoxide	Fur animals and piglets	Quality of the source of the gas. Carbon monoxide concentration. Duration of exposure. Temperature of the gas.	Point 8.
5	Carbon monoxide associated with other gases	Exposure of conscious animals to a gas mixture containing more than 1 % of carbon monoxide associated with other toxic gases.	Fur animals.	Carbon monoxide concentration. Duration of exposure. Temperature of the gas. Filtration of the gas produced from engine.	Point 8. Point 9.

Amendment

No	Name	Description	Category of animals	Key parameters
1	Carbon dioxide at high concentration	Exposure of conscious animals to a gas mixture containing more than 30% carbon dioxide.	Pigs and poultry	Carbon dioxide concentration Duration of exposure
2	Carbon dioxide at low concentration	Exposure of conscious animals to a gas mixture containing less than 30% of carbon dioxide.	Pigs and poultry	Carbon dioxide concentration Duration of exposure Maximum stun-to-stick interval in case of stunning (pigs).

3	Inert gases	Exposure of conscious animals to a inert gas mixture such Argon or Nitrogen containing less than 2% of oxygen.	Pigs and poultry.	Oxygen concentration Duration of exposure Maximum stun-to-stun of stunning (pigs).
4	Carbon monoxide (pure source)	Exposure of conscious animals to a gas mixture containing more than 4 % of carbon monoxide	Piglets	Quality of the source Carbon monoxide concentration Duration of exposure Temperature of the gas

Justification

As high concentrations of CO₂ are aversive for poultry, their use should not be allowed in abattoirs on conscious animals, but only for disease control on farms. The only exception could be the use of a biphasic method for broilers, with in the first phase mixture of 40% CO₂, 30% oxygen, 30% Nitrogen for 30 seconds, followed once the birds are unconscious by 80% CO₂ in air. Any other gas mixture with concentration of CO₂ over 30% must be approved before use. CO₂ is not a proper method for ducks and geese which are very resistant to gassing techniques. As high concentrations of CO₂ are aversive for fur animals, it must be stated that CO₂ must not be used for fur animals. The carbon monoxide has to come from a pure source only, if only filtered it could still be a cause of irritation and suffering for the animals. A preferable alternative to both carbon dioxide and pure source carbon monoxide is the use of argon.

Amendment 37

Proposal for a regulation

Annex I – chapter II – point 4.2 and 4.3

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

4.2 Foxes

deleted

Electrodes must be applied to the mouth and rectum with a current of a minimum value of 0,3 amperes and a minimum voltage of 110 volts for at least three seconds.

4.3 Chinchillas

Electrodes must be applied ear to tail with a current of a minimum value of 0,57 amperes for at least 60 seconds.

Justification

See amendment 17.

Amendment 38

Proposal for a regulation Annex I – Chapter 2 – point 7

Text proposed by the Commission

7. Carbon dioxide at high and low concentration, use of inert gases or a combination of those gas mixtures for poultry

Under no circumstances shall gases enter into the chamber or the location where poultry are to be stunned and killed in a way that it could create burns or excitement by freezing or lack of humidity.

Amendment

7. Carbon dioxide at high and low concentration, use of inert gases or a combination of those gas mixtures for poultry

7.1 Carbon dioxide at high concentration must not be used in slaughterhouses, but only in farms to kill surplus chicks or for disease control.

7.2 The only exception to the rule in 7.1 is when a biphasic method is used, with in the first phase use of a mixture of 40 % CO₂, 30 % oxygen and 30 % nitrogen for 30 seconds, followed when the birds are unconscious by 80 % CO₂ in air.

7.3 Under no circumstances shall gases enter into the chamber or the location where poultry are to be stunned and killed in a way that it could create burns or excitement by freezing or lack of humidity.

7.4. Carbon dioxide shall not be used for ducks and geese.

7.5 Birds shall not be bled unless they are dead.

Justification

As high concentrations of CO₂ are aversive for poultry, their use should not be allowed in abattoirs on conscious animals, but only for disease control on farms. The only exception could be the use of a biphasic method for broilers, with in the first phase mixture of 40% CO₂, 30% oxygen, 30% Nitrogen for 30 seconds, followed once the birds are unconscious by 80% CO₂ in air. Any other gas mixture with concentration of CO₂ over 30% must be approved before use. CO₂ is not a proper method for ducks and geese which are very resistant to gassing techniques. As high concentrations of CO₂ are aversive for fur animals, it must be stated that CO₂ must not be used for fur animals.

Amendment 39

Proposal for a regulation
Annex I – chapter II – paragraph 8

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

8. Carbon monoxide (pure source or associated with other gases) for fur animals *deleted*

8.1 Animals shall be kept under visual supervision at all times.

8.2 They shall be introduced one by one, and it shall be ensured that before the next animal is introduced the previous one is unconscious or dead.

8.3 Animals must remain in the chamber until they are dead.

Justification

See amendments 19 and 20.

Amendment 40

Proposal for a regulation
Annex I – chapter II – paragraph 9

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

9. Carbon monoxide associated with other gases for fur animals *deleted*

9.1 Gas produced by an engine specially adapted for that purpose may be used provided that tests have shown that the gas used:

(a) has been suitably cooled;

(b) has been sufficiently filtered;

(c) is free from any irritant component or gas.

9.2 Animals shall not be placed in the chamber until the minimum concentration of carbon monoxide has been reached.

Justification

See amendment 20.

Amendment 41

Proposal for a regulation

Annex III – paragraph 1 – point 1. -1 (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1.-1. When being moved, the animals shall be treated calmly. They shall have adequate space to move and their herd instinct shall be utilised. When necessary, such as in the case of equidae, the animals shall however be individually led.

Amendment 42

Proposal for a regulation

Annex III – paragraph 1 – point 1.2

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1.2 Animals must be unloaded as quickly as possible after arrival and subsequently slaughtered without undue delay.

In the case of poultry or lagomorphs, the total time of transport added to the time spent between unloading and slaughter shall not exceed 12 hours.

In the case of mammals, except lagomorphs, the total time of transport added to the time spent between unloading and slaughter shall not exceed:

(a) ***19*** hours for unweaned animals;

(b) ***24*** hours for equidae and pigs;

(c) ***29*** hours for ruminants.

After the expiry of those time limits, the animals must be lairaged, fed, and subsequently given moderate amounts of

1.2 Animals must be unloaded as quickly as possible after arrival and subsequently slaughtered without undue delay.

The total time of transport added to the time spent between unloading and slaughter shall not exceed:

(a) ***6*** hours for unweaned animals ***and animals that cannot be fed during transport or in lairage;***

(b) ***12*** hours for all other animals.

After the expiry of those time limits, the animals must be lairaged, fed, and subsequently given moderate amounts of

food at appropriate intervals. In such cases, the animals shall be provided an appropriate amount of bedding or equivalent material which guarantees a level of comfort appropriate to the species and the number of animals concerned. This material must ensure adequate absorption of urine and faeces.

food at appropriate intervals. In such cases, the animals shall be provided an appropriate amount of bedding or equivalent material which guarantees a level of comfort appropriate to the species and the number of animals concerned. This material must ensure adequate absorption of urine and faeces.

Justification

For the welfare of animals it is crucial to shorten the time of transport and lairage. Animals that are not fed during transport/lairage, e.g. poultry, should have their time of transport/lairage further reduced.

Amendment 43

Proposal for a regulation

Annex III – paragraph 1 – subparagraph 1.5 – point c a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(ca) lactating dairy animals must be killed in a mobile slaughterhouse within 12 hours.

Justification

Lactating dairy animals are exposed to major suffering during transport, and if they are not milked at least every 12 hours, due to the limited development of their hind muscles and the permanent efforts needed during the transportation to keep their balance. They are often falling down in the vehicles and exposed to further suffering when arriving as downers in abattoirs. Thus, mobile slaughterhouses must be developed, ensuring they are designed and equipped in such a way that animal welfare is taken in full consideration. As a consequence this addition must be made.

Amendment 44

Proposal for a regulation

Annex IV – table

Text proposed by Commission

Slaughter operations listed in Article 7(2)	Subjects for examination of competence
All operations listed in Article 7 (2) (a) to (f) .	Animal behaviour, animal suffering, consciousness and sensibility, stress in animals.

(a) the handling and care of animals before they are restrained;	Practical aspects of handling and restraining animals.
(b) the restraint of animals for the purpose of stunning or killing;	
(c) the stunning of animals;	Practical aspects of stunning techniques. Back-up stunning and/or killing methods. Maintenance of stunning and/or killing equipments.
(d) the assessment of effective stunning;	Monitoring the effectiveness of stunning. Back-up stunning and/or killing methods.
(e) the shackling or hoisting of live animals;	Practical aspects of handling and restraining animals.
(f) the bleeding of live animals.	Monitoring the effectiveness of stunning. Back-up stunning and/or killing methods.

Amendment

Slaughter operations listed in Article 7(2)	Subjects for examination of competence
All operations listed in Article 7 (2) (a) to <i>(fa)</i> .	Animal behaviour, animal suffering, consciousness and sensibility, stress in animals.
(a) the handling and care of animals before they are restrained;	Practical aspects of handling and restraining animals.
(b) the restraint of animals for the purpose of stunning or killing;	
(c) the stunning of animals;	Practical aspects of stunning techniques. Back-up stunning and/or killing methods. Maintenance of stunning and/or killing equipments.
(d) the assessment of effective stunning;	Monitoring the effectiveness of stunning. Back-up stunning and/or killing methods.
(e) the shackling or hoisting of live animals;	Practical aspects of handling and restraining animals.
(f) the bleeding of live animals.	Monitoring the effectiveness of stunning. Back-up stunning and/or killing methods.
<i>(fa) the killing of fur animals</i>	<i>Practical aspects of handling and restraining animals.</i>
	<i>Practical aspects of stunning techniques.</i>
	<i>Back-up stunning and/or killing methods.</i>
	<i>Maintenance of stunning and/or killing equipments.</i>
	<i>Monitoring the effectiveness of stunning.</i>

Justification

See Amendment 11 and consistency to ensure all aspects of killing fur animals are covered.

PROCEDURE

Title	Protection of animals at the time of killing
References	COM(2008)0553 – C6-0451/2008 – 2008/0180(CNS)
Committee responsible	AGRI
Opinion by Date announced in plenary	ENVI 20.11.2008
Drafts(wo)man Date appointed	Jens Holm 11.11.2008
Discussed in committee	1.12.2008
Date adopted	22.1.2009
Result of final vote	+: 40 –: 1 0: 2
Members present for the final vote	Adamos Adamou, Georgs Andrejevs, Liam Aylward, John Bowis, Frieda Brepoels, Martin Callanan, Dorette Corbey, Magor Imre Csibi, Chris Davies, Avril Doyle, Mojca Drčar Murko, Edite Estrela, Jill Evans, Anne Ferreira, Karl-Heinz Florenz, Elisabetta Gardini, Cristina Gutiérrez-Cortines, Satu Hassi, Jens Holm, Marie Anne Isler Béguin, Caroline Jackson, Dan Jørgensen, Christa Kläß, Urszula Krupa, Marie-Noëlle Lienemann, Peter Liese, Jules Maaten, Linda McAvan, Riitta Myller, Miroslav Ouzký, Vladko Todorov Panayotov, Dimitrios Papadimoulis, Guido Sacconi, Daciana Octavia Sârbu, Richard Seeber, Bogusław Sonik, María Sornosa Martínez, Thomas Ulmer, Anja Weisgerber, Glenis Willmott
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Inés Ayala Sender, Iles Braghetto, Philip Bushill-Matthews

PROCEDURE

Title	Protection of animals at the time of killing		
References	COM(2008)0553 – C6-0451/2008 – 2008/0180(CNS)		
Date of consulting Parliament	19.11.2008		
Committee responsible Date announced in plenary	AGRI 20.11.2008		
Committee(s) asked for opinion(s) Date announced in plenary	ENVI 20.11.2008		
Rapporteur(s) Date appointed	Janusz Wojciechowski 6.10.2008		
Discussed in committee	2.12.2008	19.1.2009	16.2.2009
Date adopted	16.3.2009		
Result of final vote	+: 19	–: 2	0: 1
Members present for the final vote	Luis Manuel Capoulas Santos, Joseph Daul, Gintaras Didžiokas, Carmen Fraga Estévez, Lily Jacobs, Elisabeth Jeggle, Heinz Kindermann, Stéphane Le Foll, Mairead McGuinness, Rosa Miguélez Ramos, Neil Parish, Sebastiano Sanzarello, Agnes Schierhuber, Willem Schuth, Czesław Adam Siekierski, Dimitar Stoyanov, Csaba Sándor Tabajdi, Janusz Wojciechowski		
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Katerina Batzeli, Milan Horáček, Astrid Lulling, Sebastiano (Nello) Musumeci, Catherine Neris, Maria Petre		
Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote	Iratxe García Pérez, Leopold Józef Rutowicz		
Date tabled	24.3.2009		