



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HEALTH & CONSUMER PROTECTION DIRECTORATE-GENERAL

Directorate C - Scientific Opinions

C2 - Management of scientific committees; scientific co-operation and networks

**SUMMARY RECORD OF THE MEETING OF THE
SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL HEALTH AND ANIMAL WELFARE**

Held on 5 February 2002 in Brussels

Adopted 16 April 2002

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC
COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL HEALTH AND ANIMAL WELFARE

Held on 5 February 2002 in Brussels

List of Participants

MEMBERS

Dr. R. Ahl
Dr. D. Alexander
Dr H. Blokhuis
Prof. D. M. Broom
Dr. R. Dantzer (only a.m.)
Dr. M. Gunn
Dr. P. Have
Prof. Dr. V. Moennig
Dr. D. B. Morton
Dr. P. Le Neindre, Chairman
Prof. A-L. Parodi
Prof. Dr. J. van Oirschot
Dr. M. Sharp
Dr. E. Vanopdenbosch
Prof. M. Verga
Prof. M. Wierup

COMMISSION

Mr. J. Serratosa
Mr R. Horgan
Mrs S. Iñigo
Mr. D. Simonin
Mr J. Claxton

APOLOGIES

Prof. P. Jensen
Prof. J. Noordhuizen
Prof. G. Panina

**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL HEALTH
AND ANIMAL WELFARE**

Held on 5 February 2002 in Brussels

1. Welcome and apologies

Apologies and attendance are listed on page 2.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted after some modifications. It was decided to discuss issues relating to the adopted fur report as point 7 of the agenda and the original point 7 (discussion of report on “the welfare of animals during transport) was taken as point 8. The original point 8 (discussion of a report on “Chlamydiosis”) was deferred to a future meeting.

3. Declarations of interest

No member reported any conflict of interest relating to matters under discussion at today’s meeting. Annual statements of member’s interest were distributed to all members for their signature.

4. Approval and adoption of the minutes of the previous meeting of the Committee

The summary record of the meeting of 12-13 December 2001 was adopted.

5. Report from the Sub-Committee on Animal Health (Dr R. Ahl)

A meeting of the SCAH was held on 23 January 2002 in Brussels.

The report on Avian Chlamydiosis that had been drafted by a Working Group under the chairmanship of Dennis Alexander was discussed in detail. Whereas the structure of the report was approved by the SCAH, it was felt that several items should be revised in order to express more clearly possible strategies to improve the control of the transmission of Chlamydia infections, in particular from birds to humans. In this context, Ms. M. Pittman of DG SANCO explained the forthcoming EU-legislation on the monitoring of zoonoses and zoonotic agents. The report will be presented for final discussion at the next SCAH-meeting on 20 March 2002.

Per Have gave a briefing on the first Working Group meeting on the vaccination of foxes against rabies, held on 17 January 2002. A draft report is expected by the end of April.

Mr. John Claxton of DG VI briefed the SCAH on the proposed Sixth Framework research programme. Research priority projects fitting within this program were submitted to the secretary and compiled in a list, to be discussed at the plenary meeting on 5 February.

Issues that have arisen from the report on fur animals were discussed.

6. Report from the Sub-Committee on Animal Welfare (Prof. Broom)

Since the last plenary meeting, the Sub-Committee on Animal Welfare has met once, in Brussels on the 21 January 2002.

The main topic on the agenda for that meeting was the discussion of the report on the welfare of animals during transport. The report had been discussed at one earlier meeting of the sub-committee, and at one plenary meeting. After discussion and some modifications, the report was agreed upon, and submitted to the plenary meeting for possible adoption on the 5 Feb 2002.

The other topic on the agenda was a letter from the former working group on the welfare of animals kept for fur production, which has been sent to the SCAHAW after the adoption on the report based on their draft (report was adopted on the 13 December 2002). The working group objected on procedural matters and on some of the modifications of the text that had been adopted by the SCAHAW. It was decided to draft a letter, explaining the procedures of the SCAHAW, and to submit that letter for possible adoption to the plenary on the 5 Feb 2002.

A working group has been set up to produce a report on the welfare of primates kept for laboratory purposes, and a first meeting is scheduled.

A working group is being formed to produce a report on the welfare of animals in relation to the use of different stunning methods. The question from the Commission is prompted by a perceived possible risk of the spread of TSEs in connection with stunning.

7. Discussion and possible adoption by the Committee of an amendment to the report on “The welfare of animals kept for Fur production”.

A draft letter was presented by the chairman of the Subcommittee on Animal Welfare in order to respond to an e-mail/ letter sent by 6 members (enclosed as Annex I) of the working group dealing with the report on fur animals adopted on the 12-13 December 2001. After some comments and amendments the following were unanimously decided:

1. The Scientific Committee’s response to the queries raised by the members of the working group (enclosed as Annex II).
2. Having taken into account comments raised by the Working Group members, an erratum containing corrections to the Report adopted on 12-13 December.
3. A list of additional references that have been provided by the Working Group members.

Documents 2 and 3 should be published on the Internet with the title “erratum” as soon as technically possible.

8. Discussion by the Committee of a report on “The welfare of animals during transport”

The chairman of the working group introduced the draft report. The members of the plenary expressed various opinions and the rapporteur took note of all their remarks. The

Committee chairman decided to postpone the adoption due to the long list of modifications and the lack of time to finish the revision of the document. It was decided unanimously to proceed to the adoption by written procedure.

9. Miscellaneous.

9.1. Curriculum Vitae for Publication in the Internet.

The secretary provided a copy of all CV's (in a short form) of the SCAHAW members in order to verify the data, which will be sent for publication on the Internet. Members agreed on the current versions after some minor modifications.

9.2. Animal Health and Animal Welfare priorities on research

In order to provide an appropriate reply to DG RECH on the Animal Health and Animal Welfare priorities on research, a draft, prepared as a result of the extra meeting held in Brussels on 29 January, was presented for possible adoption. It was decided to introduce some modifications to the main document. The annex containing the list of general issues will be circulated between the members and classified between three categories: Extremely important (A) Fairly important (B) Important (C).

The secretary will collect the information from the members and send it to DG RECH.

9.3. Background document on the request for an opinion to the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare related to the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing.

The subcommittee on Animal Welfare has nominated a rapporteur. The plenary decided to address the first two questions of the mandate to the Working Group. They discussed the possibility of inviting public comments via the Internet on the final part of the mandate. The secretary will investigate this possibility.

ANNEX I

To the

Scientific Committee of Animal Health and Animal Welfare,

You adopted the report on “The Welfare of Animals Kept for Fur Production”, Thursday the 13th of December, 2001, and on Wednesday the 19th of December this adopted report was made public. As members of the Working group, we hereby inform you that the adopted report is unlike the report we made in some crucial and major points. For example, it now contains several errors of fact which are, to be frank, simply embarrassing. We would also like to protest the lack of consultation that has typified the last few months, and the removal of a vast number of references from large sections of the final report. We dedicated much time to this report over the past 1½ years, and are all recognised scientists with experience in fur animal research. Therefore we feel disappointed and dismayed by how the Committee has acted since we submitted our document. .

Since our last meeting in May, there has been no communication or discussion between the members of the Working group and the Sub-committee. Robert Dantzer (head of the Working group, member of the Sub-committee and Scientific Committee) can confirm this silence. Two weeks ago we were informed that this was because of perceived ‘conflicts of interest’ within the Working Group. We find this objectionable on two grounds. First, it is insulting: we are scientists, not politicians; and any suggestion that our scientific views are affected by views of the industry is simply unacceptable. Second, it is procedurally highly unorthodox: if conflicts of interest were perceived to be an issue, they should have been discussed and aired when the Working Party started its work – not invoked in this *ad hoc* manner long after our last meeting.

This lack of consultation has not only been objectionable, it has also compromised the scientific quality of the final report, as we detail below. We take issue with three aspects of the final report. First, it seems to have become politically slanted against fur farming, especially mink farming. Second, large numbers of references have been removed. Third, it contains several errors of fact or interpretation, some of which are potentially important for animal welfare, and others of which are so ridiculous that they compromise the report’s credibility. Our draft of the report was based solely on scientific knowledge and scientific judgements, and we find these aspects of the final report surprising and disappointing, especially given how easily they could have been avoided.

The chapter on mink welfare, and its conclusions, have been changed dramatically, with a consistent elimination of positive welfare aspects of mink farming, and additions of text unknown to the Working Group (all negative towards mink farming, and with no references). As an example, the Working Group document (W) concluded that “The welfare of farmed mink is reasonably good”. This conclusion is missing in the adopted version of the report (R). While we (W) concluded that lack of swimming water for mink was a *possible* welfare problem, because the research so far is not completely conclusive, in your report, the conclusion is: ”An adequate fur-farming system for provision of swimming water has to be designed.”, implying that it is definitely important. Another example: The conclusion of our working document “Young mink are weaned after nutritional independence, in contrast to many other agricultural animals” is missing in R. R also concludes: “Weaning before nine weeks leads to a variety of welfare problems”, with

no supporting data, in contrast to the Working group conclusion: “Mink should not be weaned before 8 weeks of age..” based on solid data. This last is particularly important, as it is used to recommend not weaning before nine weeks (p. 184, R) - yet leaving a large litter together in a standard cage until this age is potentially dangerous, as we make clear in our report (W). Several other points are listed below.

The chapter on mink welfare (Chapter 9) has also lost most of its references. This gives the report a highly amateur, unsubstantiated feel, and also means that readers can no longer distinguish between work published in refereed journals and that published in internal reports etc. We can see no excuse for this. All the references supporting this chapter (around 200) were supplied to the EC in May, giving the Committee over six months to incorporate them. They were provided in alphabetical order, and were divided into refereed and un-refereed articles, as requested. If they could not after all have been typed in by staff at Brussels, they could have been returned to us for typing. There was ample time for this. Instead, we simply heard nothing, and none of these references have been used.

Finally, we are concerned at the factual errors which have now slipped into the report. For example, nursing sickness is **not** a problem for mink (cf.p. 116, R) – for example, it has not been seen in Denmark for over six years. There are **no** strains of mink which suffer from ‘blindness’ (cf. P. 117) – this is a complete fiction. Mink farming has **not** been banned in the Netherlands (cf. p. 47). Group-housing **has** been adopted commercially (cf. unsubstantiated claim on R, p. 117). Again, several other points have been listed below.

Overall, we feel that the Committee has chosen to focus only on a few examples showing welfare problems (for example studies from the 1980s expressing a high degree of stereotypy in mink), and that Committee has chosen to downplay the vast amount of studies showing positive aspects of welfare. Below are some of the further points where we find the changes and added text un-acceptable. There are several welfare problems in fur animals like in most confined animals, but most of these can be reduced by the present scientific knowledge. The reduction or elimination of the remaining welfare problems must be based on further research, not on anecdotal evidence.

We sincerely hope that you will consider withdrawing the report and asking the Sub-committee to do a more objective job based on the scientific evidence provided in the final draft from the last meeting of the Working Group. We are willing to help with this process. If you choose to keep the adoption of the report as now stands, the following authors of this letter withdraw from the Working Group and request that our names are deleted from the list of the Working Group members.

03.01.02

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Vivi Pedersen, Zoological Institute, University of Copenhagen
(VPedersen@zi.ku.dk),

PROF. BJARNE BRAASTAD, AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY OF NORWAY
(BJARNE.BRAASTAD@IHF.NLH.NO)

Dr. Vet. Erik Smeds, Finland (Erik.Smeds@kolumbus.fi)

Dr. Teppo Rekila, Agricultural Research Center of Finland,
(teppo.rekila@mtt.fi)

Dr. Georgia Mason, Dept. of Zoology, Oxford University,
(Georgia.mason@zoo.ox.ac.uk)

Dr. Gerrit de Jonge, The Netherlands, (leipoldt@rulsfb.leidenuniv.nl)

Comparisons of the working group document W and the adopted version R.

- In R, chapter 2 you state that “*this report contains only scientific assessments and scientifically based conclusions on how their welfare can be improved*” but you fail to fulfil this statement. Below the evidence for this failure is further documented
- In R, chapter 6.3 conclusions and in conclusion, chapter 17, no. 11: You have removed “blue foxes” in your sentence: “Selection for reduced fearfulness towards humans is successful and results in positive welfare effects in the species studied : silver fox and mink”. To support yourself, you have removed a whole chapter with scientific evidence that selection for reduced fearfulness is successful in blue foxes too, namely chapter: 10.14 page 159-162 in W. And actually you conclude in 15.6 that selection against fearfulness is effective in foxes, chapter 15.6.
- In R, page 42, chapter 6.2.2 you state that “the farm breed blue fox is less domesticated than the blue fox”, which is very different from the sentence in W, page 41, lines 27-29: “The farm breed blue fox is not domesticated sensu stricto, although it is claimed to be adapted to captivity.”
- In R, page 47, chapter 7, you state that fur farming is banned in the Netherlands. This is not true. Only Great Britain banned fur farming as the W correctly mentions.
- On the same page you have deleted 4 sentences in R, expressing in W that enclosures to foxes gave rise to hygienic and parasite problems in the 40’ies (with a reference)
- On page 86, in R, you have changed a sentence into something much broader: You have deleted the word “food” in front of deprivation (in W, page 94, line 25)
- In R, page 86, second paragraph on abnormal behaviours II self chewing, you have added a new paragraph. It is unknown text to us and not documented with references (no data).
- On the same page you have changed a past tense to present, again making another meaning of the statement. We refer to an old survey of mink fur-chewing from 1984 stating that these kind of problems existed on every farm in those days (W, page 94, line 34). You changed it to “exist on every farm” (R, page 86), which there is no data to support.
- In W, chapter 9.2, page 99: This later report concluded that compared to the pig and poultry industries the fur industries practices are relatively benign. We agree with that view here, but also emphasise.....” This paragraph is deleted in R, page 89.
- In W, sentence 18-20, page 99 chapter 9.2.1 “Pregnant mink are generally quiet and well-fed and prenatal stress which can have long term effects on the offspring’s HPA function is unlikely to be a major issue for mink” This has been removed in R, page 89.
- In R, page 90, you have added 4 sentences from a study and you have deleted a sentence from W page 99, line 34: “though in normal practice it is unlikely to represent a major welfare issue for the typical farmed mink”
- In R, page 90, chapter 9.2.2 you have deleted the words “and during nursing” ignoring the results of the referred study (W, page 99, line 42)

- In R, page 92, you have deleted a paragraph in W, page 102, chapter 9.2.2 “...only some appears directly attributable to poor husbandry or welfare”
- In R, page 92, you have deleted a sentence in W, page 102, line 25/26 “...suggest that infancy is a time of high welfare for mink”
- In R, page 93, you have removed:” In conclusion, however, the welfare of growing infant mink seems to be good; morbidity and mortality are low, with good farm management and levels of playing and social interactions are high (W, page 103, line 28-30)”
- In R, page 94, you have removed a whole paragraph “...we recommend that weaning never occurs earlier than 8 weeks and preferably later.....” (W, page 105, line 24 and on)
To complete this you conclude that weaning should not take place earlier than 9 weeks of age, despite our conclusions that it should not take place prior to 8 weeks of age (which is supported by data)
- In R, page 99, welfare of family housed kits, you have added a lot of new text, praising group/family housing despite the data documenting welfare problems with this system. You have also chosen to erase all reference by Danish researcher (published in AABS, ACTA) on mink and group/family housing, despite the fact that you continuously refer to de Jonge (published in Dutch in national magazines or un-published). The scientific references are in W in that chapter. Why chose to eliminate them? You also refer wrongly to de Jonge on results from the Danish studies (scientifically published) several times on page 100-101.
- In R, page 103 you have deleted a sentence from W (page 113) “ Adult mink is generally healthy.....”
- In R, page 111, you have removed a sentence from W, page 121:”female stereotypy is low during pregnancy.”
- In R, page 109, reference from Hansen and Jeppesen, 199, 2000, 2001 is deleted from the text, though they are referred to (published in scientific journals) (W, page 118).
- In R, page 113, 114, 115, Scientific publications from Danish research team are again ignored, though in W, page 121-123.
- in W (9.2.12, 1) and (16,30) it is stated that
“The welfare of mink is reasonably good, at least compared with other intensively farmed animals”. This statement is deleted in R, page 116, 9.2.12
- W (9.2.12,4) and (16,33) states that “Mink shows little fear of humans, and despite being naturally solitary, largely seems to adapt well to the enforced proximity of conspecifics.” This statement is deleted in R, page 116, 9.2.12. On the contrary it is suggested/concluded in several places (e.g.17,39) that "inability to avoid social contact" is a problem, which impairs mink welfare.
- W (9.2.12,3) and (16,32) states that
“Breeding of farmed mink is generally unproblematic”.
This statement is deleted in R, which reads instead (R page 116): “The mortality of mink kits during nursing period has been reported to be up to 30% with a mean of 20%. - - - Lactation is a period of high risk especially because of nursing disease”. Nursing sickness is no longer a major problem, as we detail in W; for example, it has not been reported in Denmark for the last six or seven years.

- W (9.2.12,5) and (16,34) is changed:
“Locomotor stereotypies can occur in farmed mink. However, their prevalence can often be reduced by simple measures such as high levels of feeding” to R (page 116): Stereotypies, largely locomotor in nature, are widespread on mink farms. - - “
- Similarly, R now concludes, on the basis on negligible data, that gastric ulcers are widespread in farmed mink (p. 116).
- W (9.2.12,6) and (16,35) is missing:
“Young mink are weaned after nutritional independence, in contrast to many other agricultural animals”. Instead: R (page 116): Weaning before nine weeks leads to a variety of welfare problems.
- W (9.2.12,8+9) and (16,38+40) talk about possible welfare problems and aspects that can impair welfare: "- Several aspects of husbandry can impair mink welfare. - - Possible welfare problems include.."
R generally omit the reservations (possible and can) and mentions problems as if they were well documented facts, e.g. (17,39): "The typical mink cage - - impairs mink welfare -. Particular problems are -."
- R (page 116) mentions self-mutilation of tail or limb tissue as widespread. This was not part of W and is not supported by scientific evidence.
- When it comes to group housing and swimming water the presentation in R is apparently extremely twisted. W gives a warning against group housing (9.2.12,10 " The welfare consequences - are not yet fully assessed") and mentions "lack of water to swim in" as a possible welfare problem (9.2.12,9). R (page 116 "None of these systems has yet been adopted commercially") leads to the impression that it is regrettable that group housing is not yet introduced in practice, and R simply claims that: "Adequate fur-farming system for provision of swimming water has yet to be designed" on page 116, but on page 178 (no. 32) it states “has to be design”, which has a very different meaning.
- Contaminated food is NOT give to mink (R., p. 117) – where is the evidence for this? Botulin poisoning is only a potential risk because of the nature of the food (as with any meat-based products), but to claim that farmers deliberately risk poisoning or use seriously condemned meat is inaccurate.
- What colour types of mink experience ‘blindness’? (R., p. 117). This is a fiction.
- In R, page 122 new text have been added: Farmed silver foxes have been claimed to express extreme fear....” Not in W page 131. Fearfulness in foxes is a welfare problem, as is also concluded in W. But “extreme” fear is only rarely seen in some foxes, for example when a group of unfamiliar humans approach the cage.
- In R, page 125, added sentences “.... Needs of foxes for locomotor.....” Not in W, page 134.
- In R, page 141, added new text on a German survey with no references, Not in W.
- In R, chapter 10.11, page 150: the following paragraph (5 in W, 10.15) is missing: “*Mortality and morbidity are generally low and foxes are generally in good physical health*”
- **The following paragraphs are also missing in R (W, page 161/162):** “Transportation is rare since slaughter is carried out on sight”;“Ways of reducing fearfulness based on selection are available”;“Ways of improving the physical and social environment to attenuate reproductive disorders and reduce monotony are available”;“Losses on farms appear to be less than those in the wild...”

- *Paragraph 4 on chinchilla conclusion, page 157 in R is a new one, no data in W (page 167) support this new statement.*
- *In R, page 172, no. 7, a warning stated in W has been deleted: “However, selection which produces excessive exploratory tendencies could have negative effects on welfare”*
- *In R, Recommendations, chapter 18, page 159 this text is added: Until there is sufficient information on the welfare of raccoon dogs, keeping of this species on fur farms should be discouraged” .*
The following is the conclusion on welfare of raccoon dogs from W, chapter 12.2:
 - 1 *Although raccoon dogs are in general treated like foxes, there are not enough data to determine whether their welfare is at risk in commercial conditions.*
 - 2 *Their reproduction in captivity appears to be good, and raccoon dogs are generally in good physical health.*
 - 3 *Possible welfare problems include wire floors, barren environments, weaning age, pre-clinical conditions, foot problems, lack of mate choice and monogamy*
- *In R, conclusions no. 12, page 176 have been dramatically changed. In W it said: Generally, compared to other farm animal species, fur animals have been subjected to low or moderate breeding intensity. Furthermore their environmental conditions have changed little over years and are similar for breeding and growing animals. These are both positive factors for the health, coping ability and welfare of fur animals”. In R, it says now: “.....species of farmed fur have been subjected to relatively little active selection.....”*
- *The kit mortality of 20% is used as evidence that mink experience poor welfare (p. 183), despite the evidence given in W. that this level is the same as that displayed in zoos, and lower than that seen in the wild.*
- *The recommendation that kits be left together until nine weeks (p. 184) is potentially dangerous unless this is limited to small litters only, or conducted in enlarged cages, due the risks of aggression. We make this quite clear in W.*

ANNEX II

To the members of the working group on "The welfare of animals kept for fur production"

The Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare (SCAHAW) has received a letter with comments on the report "The welfare of animals kept for fur production", from members of the working group drafting this report. At its meeting in Brussels on the 5th of February 2002, the SCAHAW adopted the following response:

We thank the members of the working group sincerely for the efforts they have put into the preparation of the draft of this report. We also thank them for the detailed scrutiny of the report as adopted by the Scientific Committee and for the comments provided. Certain errors in the report have been pointed out and these will be corrected. A revised version will be published as soon as possible. The revisions are detailed below. However, none of the revisions lead the SCAHAW to change the recommendations in the report.

The comments from the working group on the report fall into two different categories. Firstly, there are procedural objections. Secondly, there are a number of identified differences between the draft of the working group and the report finally approved by SCAHAW.

1. Procedure

The SCAHAW consists of two sub-committees, the Sub-Committee on Animal Health (SCAH) and the Sub-committee on Animal Welfare (SCAW). These committees are responsible within their main areas of competence for the drafting and preliminary editing of reports. However, all questions from the EU-commission are posed to the SCAHAW, and all reports have to be adopted by the SCAHAW in its plenary sessions; hence the SCAHAW is responsible for answering the questions it has received from the EU-Commission. The normal procedure when a question has been received from the Commission is to allocate the question to one of the two sub-committees, which thereafter sets up a working group under the chairmanship of one of the committee members. The working group members are selected on the basis of their expertise in the specific area of the question, and their task is to draft a report in response to the question.

Once the working group has drafted the report, the sub-committee edits the report and formulates conclusions and recommendations. Thereafter the report is submitted to the SCAHAW, and further editing and revision may follow before the report is finally adopted. It is therefore normal procedure that both the sub-committee and the SCAHAW revise and modify the text, for example in relation to areas of expertise additional to those of working group members. The adopted report will normally differ from the original draft drawn up by the working group.

The SCAHAW emphasises the importance of this process. It is essential for the consistency and transparency of the scientific advisory process that all reports are

adopted by the SCAHAW members, and in particular that the conclusions and recommendations express the opinions of the SCAHAW. Several reports are produced each year, and in order to increase the consistency of the advice, the formats of the reports are standardised as far as possible. There are standard ways in which scientific conclusions and recommendations are formulated and these are regularly discussed and revised within the committee.

The working group members are therefore right in that the report differs from the draft they produced. However, this is true for more or less any report adopted by the SCAHAW. In the present case, the draft of the working group did not follow the standards of the committee reports in a number of places. For example, the SCAHAW as a principle avoids subjective judgements in the conclusions section and comparisons with the welfare of other species. There were also places where recommendations had been put in the text of the draft rather than in the Recommendations section.

In order for the report to be in the acceptable format, rather extensive revision was required. However, the revision of the text mainly consisted of language improvements and the movement of some sections between chapters. In a few places, some missing observations and data were included by the committee, but they were not essential for the final recommendations. No actual data have been removed from the draft, and the conclusions and recommendations are therefore based almost exclusively on the studies and data which the working group has provided in the draft.

The SCAHAW regrets that these procedural matters apparently were not sufficiently well known to the working group. In order to make this more clear to the readers of the report, the acknowledgements have been revised as indicated below.

2. Factual differences between the report and the draft of the working group

It is acknowledged that the conclusions and recommendations adopted by the SCAHAW on the welfare of animals kept for fur production differ from those proposed initially by the working group. However, the scientific data on which these conclusions and recommendations are made are, with only a few additions, those that have been provided by the working group. The SCAHAW therefore fully endorses the responsibility of its conclusions and recommendations.

Most other factual differences, identified by members of the working group in their letter to the SCAHAW, reflect editing in order to comply with the standards of format. Some of the changes attributed to the SCAHAW were actually not done by the committee. For example, the text on group housing of mink, which members of the working group claim that the committee has added, was already included in the draft received from the working group.

A large number of references in the text to reports, mainly on the welfare of mink, were not in the list of references of the draft. These references were omitted from the text during editing of the report. However, the data and findings from these references were left in the text, and formed part of the basis for the conclusions and recommendations. A list of missing references provided by the working group has been compiled and introduced into the revised version of the report in a suitable format.

Some factual errors have been identified by the working group, and we thank you for bringing those to our attention. These are mostly editorial and typesetting errors, and will be corrected in the revised version of the report, as indicated below.

3. Revisions

Based on the comments from the working group, the report will be revised as follows:

- The formerly missing references will be included in the report in a suitable format.
- Page 46, conclusion 8, and page 176, conclusion 11; "...in the species studied: silver fox and mink." is changed to "in the species studied."
- Page 47, line 5; "...and banned fur farming,..." is changed to "...and banned some fur farming,..."
- Page 117, conclusion 9, and page 178, conclusion 37; "...has yet been adopted commercially" is changed to "...has yet been widely adopted commercially".
- Page 117, conclusion 11, and page 178, conclusion 39; "...deafness, blindness or other sensory impairment..." is changed to "...deafness, or other sensory impairment..."
- Page 178, conclusion 32; "...has to be designed." is changed to "...has yet to be designed".
- Page 211. The following text is inserted at the end of the page: "The working group drafted the report, which was then edited and amended by the Scientific Committee on Animal Health and Animal Welfare. The Scientific Committee is fully responsible for the final text, including the conclusions and recommendations, and the members of the working group may therefore not necessarily agree with all parts of the report."