# Options
# Animal Welfare labelling

Fourth  meeting of the animal welfare labelling subgroup

European Commission

# What is the problem?

- **P1 – Consumers coverage**: many consumers have no choice
- **P2 – Information quality**: no easy way to compare welfare claims
- **P3 – Uneven playing field**: proliferation of labels hide the best ones
- **P4 – Renationalisation**: national labels fragment the internal market
- **P5 – Non EU imports:** there is no fair competition with imports

# What are the options?

- ~~1. Regulating animal welfare claims~~
- ~~2. EU label focused on cages/non-cage systems~~
  - ➢ ~~Voluntary or compulsory~~
- **3. EU label with key welfare criteria**

# An EU label with key welfare criteria

- **3 sub-options**
  - V1-Voluntary single tier (organic or Eco-label type)
  - VM-Voluntary multi-tier (Danish or Nutriscore type)
  - MM- Mandatory multi-tier (egg type)
- All includes various key welfare criteria, a governance system, rules on controls, traceability and imports

# What are the impacts?

- On the problems

| Problems | V1 | VM | MM |
|---|---|---|---|
| P1 consumers coverage | 0 | + | ++ |
| P2 Information quality | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| P3 Uneven playing field | ++ | + | ++ |
| P4 Renationalisation | ++ | ++ | ++ |
| P5 Non EU imports | + | + | ++ |
| **OVERALL** | **7+** | **7+** | **10+** |

You believe the impact to be:
**very positive++, positive+, neutral 0, negative –, very negative --**

European Commission

# What are the impacts?

- On stakeholders (costs/benefits)

| Stakeholders | V1 | VM | MM |
|---|---|---|---|
| Operators | + | ++ | -- /++ |
| Consumers | + | + | ++ |
| EU (costs) | - | - | - |
| National authorities | - | -- | -- |
| Animals | + | + | ++ |
| Other players? | | | |

You believe the impact to be:
**very positive++, positive+, neutral 0, negative –, very negative --**

# How to refine the option?

- Any way to complement or refine the option to
  - ➢ improve its positive impacts?
  - ➢ decrease its negative impacts?