

Journey Times + Exports

Options	PROS	CONS	IMPACTS	ALTERNATIVES
<p>Journey times (according to EFSA opinions) of max 12 hours.</p> <p>For all animals.</p>	<p>This would be in line with EFSA recommendations and the need to keep the journey times short.</p> <p>There would not be an issue during the summer given that 12 hours would allow for transport by night.</p> <p>It is more environmentally friendly.</p> <p>It treats all animals equally.</p> <p>The shorter the time, the better for welfare and the less risks of encountering problems.</p>	<p>Does not differentiate between species and groups of animals within different species.</p> <p>EFSA also admitted having less sources and studies on transport.</p> <p>Not all MS have a sufficient network of slaughterhouses to allow only 12 h journey. Sometimes these journeys happen for reasons of convenience in terms of economic profitability even when there are slaughterhouses close by.</p> <p>The geographical situation and infrastructure of many countries prevents this measure from working in practice and would have a serious social, economic and environmental impact. Especially some countries within EU depend on intra-trade access like Ireland.</p> <p>Restrictions on journey time will disrupt the dissemination of genetic improvements within EU, which is an important tool for lower</p>		<p>Improving existing transport of animals. The quality of the transport has improved with 1/2005; some short journeys are done in worse conditions on board than long journeys meeting the current conditions.</p> <p>Attention should be paid to how quality of transport can be improved like eg. access to feed and water, resting periods, stocking density, changes to vehicles, age, pregnancy level, new category 3 lorry for long distance transport.</p> <p>Better enforcement: people do not comply with current rules and that leads to negative experiences.</p> <p>Some members also remarked that there have been 15 years to improve enforcement and experience in the field showed that the current legal tool is insufficient and defective and needs to be improved, therefore some changes of the legislation are needed.</p> <p>There must be uniform implementation and control of</p>

		<p>environmental impact and improved animal health</p>		<p>the legal minimum standards in all EU member states. Industry-specific standards, to which all parties involved in a transport chain must commit, could also be beneficial</p> <p>EFSA addresses the needs of animals on board: the solution could be to fulfil these needs rather than limiting the journey times. Yet some members indicate that EFSA also states that the proper feeding, watering and resting can only happen when animals are unloaded.</p> <p>Some derogations could be foreseen if needed.</p> <p>If animals are fit for transport there is no reason to limit the journey time. However, it was also specified that fitness at departure does not necessarily last during transport: science also indicates that the longer the transport, the worse effects on aw.</p>
<p>Journey times for animals for slaughter: max. 8-9 hours</p>	<p>Animals for slaughter need the limit more than others more valuable as they are often transported in poor welfare conditions.</p>	<p>Spain and Portugal and Ireland would not see their economic and social needs addressed by this limitation. Even when they're neighbouring countries it takes more than 8 hours to transport for slaughter.</p>	<p>It will take time to adapt but the objectives of the F2F would be met.</p> <p>Slaughterhouses would have to adapt both in terms of density and economic models.</p>	<p>Improving existing transport of animals. There should be a differentiation between age groups and also on type of lorries.</p> <p>Better enforcement: people do not comply with current rules and</p>

	<p>It is more environmentally friendly, promotes local slaughter and production.</p> <p>The needs of the animals are the same, no matter the category, therefore one common journey limit was proposed.</p>	<p>Sometimes these journeys happen for reasons of economic profitability despite having slaughterhouses nearby.</p> <p>Not all MS have a good network of slaughterhouses. Some members stressed that the network of slaughterhouses will not change dramatically: they are closing. These would only change if customers would pay more for locally slaughtered animals. This proposal is not economically viable.</p> <p>The legislative framework on slaughter facilities in EU is driving a development towards large scale slaughter facilities that is in conflict with ambition of short distances to slaughter.</p> <p>There are different legal and therefore economic reasons for slaughterhouses to centralize. This must be taken into account in addition to animal welfare aspects.</p> <p>It is unclear whether there could be an obligation to go to the closest slaughterhouse</p>		<p>that leads to negative experiences.</p> <p>There must be uniform implementation and control of the legal minimum standards in all EU member states. Industry-specific standards, to which all parties involved in a transport chain must commit, could also be beneficial</p> <p>Some members also remarked that there have been 15 years to improve enforcement and experience in the field showed that the current legal tool is insufficient and defective and needs to be improved, therefore some changes of the legislation are needed.</p> <p>EFSA addresses the needs of animals on board: the solution could be to fulfil these needs rather than limiting the journey times. Yet some members indicate that EFSA also states that the proper feeding, watering and resting can only happen when animals are unloaded.</p> <p>Some members stressed that would prefer longer journeys for animals for slaughter but improving their transport means.</p>
--	---	--	--	--

		<p>preventing using slaughterhouses in another MS for trade/economic reasons.</p>		<p>Some derogations could be foreseen if needed.</p> <p>If animals are fit for transport there is no reason to limit the journey time. Other members also pointed out that even if the animals are fit for the transport, it does not mean they can endure thirst, hunger, lack of rest for more than 12 hours. The problem of long journey times is not only the fitness at departure, but the stress inherent in transportation as time on board extends</p> <p>Training on fitness for transport should be improved: most of the issues with animals for slaughter relate to a bad assessment on their fitness.</p>
<p>Journey times of max. 21 h for all other animals (except for dogs, cats and animals in containers).</p>	<p>It would make it possible to reach many destinations within EU. There would be a possible agreement on having this limitation with a stop for feeding.</p>	<p>On 21 + 24 + 21 on animals for breeding coming from other MS, not enough control posts are available and there are areas that are particularly difficult to go through. It would still be difficult to impossible for some northern countries to reach Portugal for example.</p> <p>21 h would not represent a big change compared to the current situation. However in this case it would be a</p>	<p>Type 3 trucks would need to be in place for journeys going beyond 21 hours.</p>	<p>Improving transport conditions is more important for some members given that all MS need breeding animals.</p> <p>There should be a differentiation between age groups and also on type of lorries. An alternative could be to introduce the requirements of a type 3 lorries for transport going beyond 21 hours to improve quality of transport.</p>

		<p>maximum journey time: after 21 h there won't be any further transport. Measures would need to be taken in terms of the definition of place of destination to make sure no further transport takes place after 21h.</p>		<p>In addition, there should be, according to some members, a strict definition on the purpose for transport and the number of times they can be transported throughout their life.</p> <p>In line with AHL, within 20 days an animal should be transported once for 21h and then rested for another 20 days. Other members indicated that this does not work for breeding animals.</p>
<p>Do we allow the resting in control posts?</p> <p>*information: EFSA indicates that 24 hours are enough for animals to recover.</p> <p>If so for how many cycles?</p>	<p>It would allow reaching even more destinations than only 12 h</p>	<p>Not enough control posts are available and there are areas that are particularly difficult to go through.</p> <p>Unweaned animals are not fed at control posts. Sometimes they have electrolytes.</p>	<p>The definition of control post as place of departure would need to be redefined so as to limit this possibility (e.g. control post is within 100 km).</p> <p>Control posts would need to be built if there is a need by means of legislative provisions. On the other hand, it was also stressed that control posts are private business: not easy to make sure they are in place.</p>	<p>Assurance that the animals will be properly fed in control posts could also be a solution.</p> <p>For some species, like horses, this requirement should be less strict as no control posts are available.</p>
<p>Ban on export of large and small ruminants</p>	<p>Animal welfare would be ensured.</p> <p>There is no system in place to ensure animal welfare, lack of system to control the</p>	<p>Not feasible to decide which countries deserve to receive EU animals for breeding, some members expressed.</p> <p>Not feasible either for food security reasons: breeding</p>	<p>Slaughter and handling of animals would not comply with the EU in terms of imports.</p>	<p>Controls on TC could be organised as well as EU wide commitments of supply centres that can be controlled by the EU and building up a network of control posts outside.</p>

	<p>environmental impact of intensive animal farming and slaughtering in third countries.</p>	<p>animals are a factor of building food security in other countries not only within the EU. Is also important for lower environmental impact and improved animal health on a global level.</p> <p>In a global context, banning or limiting these exports would lead TC to import from farther away countries hence exposing animals to welfare risks.</p>		<p>Rather than banning transports it would be more useful to not authorising transport operations unless all conditions are met: therefore option below is preferred.</p> <p>Some members stressed that rather than talking of a ban, it would be more a matter of not authorizing export to non EU countries because of insurmountable obstacles that make it a priori impossible to comply with the law: no way to guarantee and control aw once outside the EU, no animal protection regulations outside the EU, inevitable delays at the borders.</p> <p>This raises the question of whether we should distinguish between the purposes of transport. If twice as many lorries carry animals for slaughter, then this is harmful to the environment. When frozen, we no longer need to take animal welfare concerns into account. This is not the case with breeding animals. They must be transported alive in order to fulfil their purpose (e.g. building a population) on site. In the case of live animal transports, we also have to take into account the species and type of animals</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				(cattle, pigs, sheep, but also with horns, male, female, etc.). The presentation is described very abbreviated.
Exports under stricter conditions	Better conditions also at destination could be addressed together with control posts. In the EU the consumption is decreasing but keeping exports also helps maintaining the farming sector in the EU.	21 + 24 + 21 is not adequate for exporting. Some members indicated that no huge intervention on exports should be made.	While some countries have a quarantine period at destination, some others do not. This could be addressed among the measures foreseen. Exports of animals are slowly decreasing to some countries/some species. This is an element that should be taken into account.	Enforcing is fundamental and no transports should be authorised if they meet all conditions. Lessons can be learned from Australia and best practices already drafted. An alternative could be to introduce the requirements of a type 3 lorries for transport going beyond 21 hours to improve quality of transport.

- Germany limits the transport to slaughterhouses to 4.5h in very high temperatures. These should not exceed 30 degrees even if it is only in a part of the journey. A member informed that their transporters are advised to check weather forecast and take screenshots to prove they have done so. The temperature taken is the outside temperature. On type 2 there are temperature devices but not in type 1. For competent authorities is difficult to assess where does the temperature need to be measured and when.
- It was remarked that generally, it is advisable to lower the journey times.
- Place of departure and place of destination need to be better defined so as to avoid journey hopping.
- In Germany the animals are sold to other MS, they stay there for 48h and then they travel everywhere from there and the operators don't know what happens with them. Uniformed requirements in the whole EU is of utmost importance, together with uniformed and harmonised controls across the different MS.
- Generally speaking breeding animals are needed in all MS. And all MS need very different realities.
- Assembly centres: three can be used and animals can be on the road for 20 days under AHL. Animal health rules need to be taken into account so as to ensure coherence and that the system works. Assembly centres and control posts should be treated equally: the same risks in terms of health and welfare occur. The times of unloading and loading should be same in both. Purposes for both assembly centres and control posts should be better defined. Assembly centres change the "or" for "and". Assembly centres should be used only for short distances and not long journey transports.
- On avoiding journey hopping, a decision needs to be taken regarding the time animals have to be kept at place of destination.

- Some of the main problems with exports were mentioned: biggest issue is control. Subsidies in the past were a source of fraud in certification. The proposed tertiary legislation may not be enough to warrant animal welfare. Getting information from third countries is extremely challenging. Another issue is the exported breeding animals do not reach optimal production because there is not enough feed. Lack of electricity for cold chain is true but at the same time they need electricity for slaughter.

AOB: Presentation on best practices of long-distance transport of unweaned calves

He explained how they feed calves during transport and how often does this happen.

Currently the interval for transporting calves is 9 hours driving, 1 hours rest to feed on the truck, 9 hours driving. Then a stop shall be made at a control post before resuming another round of 9+1+9.

As best practices the company starts with milk replacer 3 hours before loading after which they rest. During the hour on truck calves are feed with onboard drink and after that pause they continue till destination where the receiver has to feed calves with milk replacer directly after unloading. 4-6 teats are available in each compartment for the calves to drink from.

During the 24h resting for calves on a control post they make sure they are fed three times: right after unloading, after 10 hours, after another 10 hours and 3 hours before loading.

Fresh straw is provided in control posts and enough space in the boxes for them to lay down, as well as keeping them in small groups respecting the groups made on the truck. Every calve has their own bucket where to eat/drink from so as to control whether they are drinking properly.

Official authorities control thoroughly. This way of transporting, feeding and resting calves allows for long distance transport while respecting the welfare of these animals. Feedback is also fundamental to know what needs to be improved.

Exact and easy rules for the transport of calves, exact handling to use these rules, a better indication on how to implement rules and having a good and fair sanctioning systems need to be in place for the proposal on transport rules.