



European
Commission

Meeting of the sub-group on transport

Economic Activity

Indicators

Journey Log

Tenth meeting, 28 March 2023 14:30-17:30

(In person, DG SANTE)

– **MINUTES** –

Attendance

Civil society organisations	Animal Welfare Foundation Animals' Angels
Business and professional organisations	Copa
Member States	Portugal The Netherlands Spain The Czech Republic
European Commission	DG SANTE G3

Discussion

1. Definition of "Economic activity"

- The participants agreed on the need to have a definition of "economic activity".
- Some participants suggested to have the definition linked to those companies registered as businesses.



- Slovenia's definition is the recital 12 of the current Regulation 1/2005.
- A list of what is not an economic activity, in addition to the definition, could be added in an Annex.
- A suggestion was made on using the same classifications already in place in other regulations (e.g. AHL, Food Law)
- Some exceptions are needed for horses, pets and pigeons.
- Flexibility for MS to adapt exceptions to their own realities was called for.
- In terms of the definition, there was an agreement on addressing aspects such as legal entity, ownership, distance, purpose of the transport and volume of animals transported.
- There was a suggestion to include in the scope of "economic activity" any transport happening between two or more MS.
- Guidelines (EU or/and MS) on the basis of the definition were proposed.

2. Policy Indicators

- The lack of indicators in the current regulation was agreed to be one of the weakest elements of 1/2005.
- The templates adopted by Commission Decision in 2013 which included a wide range of elements could be used as indicators.
- Common and harmonised instructions to MS are needed to track targets and trends in the implementation of the rules.
- Penalties and sanctions are an important element but there are significant variations in MS in application.
- Mortality is an iceberg indicator not relevant for journeys and declared place of destination
- Better analysis of the data gathered by MS is needed to help putting the results in context
- Improving the reporting of non-compliances by MS (many non-compliances found during the inspections done by the other CA rather than official veterinarians (like police, traffic inspectors, etc,..) are not reported. Lack of a proper communication system.
- Thresholds for action should also be agreed, quantity is not always a quality
- Number of checks and controls must also be harmonised: Commission to indicate % of vessels, species, categories, transports... to be checked
- Increased frequency of Commission audits in MS needed
- For MS, fitness for transport must be the priority in terms of indicators
- Space allowances, watering devices, temperature, fitness for transport, vehicles were mentioned as priority indicators
- A participant suggested inspections on 100% of vehicles

3. Journey logs

- MS suggested to remove sections 2, 3 and 4 and strengthen controls on sns systems. Declarations only from drivers are not reliable
- Some participants considered important to have a declaration from drivers in case of non-compliances



- There was a call for harmonisation in the way competent authorities perform their checks
- A journey log should be mandatory when two types of transport are combined so as to coordinate the arrival of e.g. trucks at port before loading to roro vessels
- Competent authorities use de facto an existing website to calculate the route plan
- Journey log should be electronic and live tracking of GPS from trucks was suggested
- Current template needs to be upgraded with number of animals, species, categories (e.g. fleeced or shorn ovine, animals with horns, weight of each category...)
- More space to include places of departure and destination
- Planning should indicate foreseen stops at port or stops longer than 30 mins and the reason for these stops
- Indication of phone number of drivers
- Specific requirements for ferries
- Journey logs also mandatory for long journeys within the same MS
- Certification at destination from an independent third party indicating that animals arrived in good conditions (possible inclusion of private vets)
- Journey Logs are important for authorities other than official vets, eg police, traffic inspectors. These competent authorities do not have access to Traces NT or SNS systems, therefore the paper version of the journey log is currently of utmost importance for them to perform the checks regarding the time of departure, if the rest and feed periods were observed etc. Although information on the movement of the vehicle can be obtained by the tachograph readings, this is not sufficient for the Police and traffic inspectors to successfully perform their documentary checks. They need also section 4 where the driver declares what he was doing during the time that the vehicle was not moving.

