

11th meeting of the EU Platform on animal welfare

Subgroup on Animal Welfare at the time of killing
Overview of the work done



Denis SIMONIN, senior expert, DG SANTE/G5

The subgroup

- 10 members + Commission + guests

- **1 Independent expert**

Birte Nielsen

- **2 Civil society organisations**

Eurogroup for animals / CIWF

- **3 Business and professional organisations**

UECBV /EMN /FVE

- **4 Member States**

Spain /Netherlands / Sweden / Ireland

- 4 meetings since March

Topics of discussion

- Inception Impact Assessment of July 2021
 - ✓ Pre-approval system for restraining and stunning equipment
 - ✓ Prohibition of waterbath stunning (poultry)
 - ✓ Prohibition of electrical prods
 - ✓ simplification + CCTV
- Prohibition of carbon dioxide at high concentration (pigs)
- Requirements for farmed fish

Restraining and stunning equipment

- Problems:
 - Bad initial design
 - Different use from original design
 - Manufacturers outside scope and missing instructions
 - Equipment complex to evaluate
 - Limited competence of local authority
- Baseline:
 - Problems not be solved without EU intervention
 - Economic pressure for high throughput and meat quality will persist

Certificate type approval for equipment

- Description: Member State or EU level /fees / official list in all EU / transitional period
- Impacts on the problem
 - +++ for design, use, instructions, complexity and local authorities
- Impacts on stakeholders
 - (-) administrative burden and innovation especially SMEs
 - (--) not harmonious approach if national level
- Refining
 - Procedure limited to the most complex equipment (electrical)

Waterbath stunning

- Problems:
 - *Intrinsic issues*: inversion, shackling, variable impedance of birds
 - *Incorrect use*: bad shackling, pre-stun shocks, conflict with meat quality, low parameters (high frequency), high speed
- Baseline:
 - Intrinsic problems unsolvable
 - Economic pressure for high throughput and meat quality will persist
 - Possible development of automatic checks

Prohibition of waterbath stunning

- Description: transitional period,
- Impacts on the problem
 - +++ on intrinsic issues with gas (but less for head-only – inversion/shackling)
 - ++ on misuse but drivers still persist
- Impacts on stakeholders
 - (---) no commercially available alternative for small and medium size slaughterhouses + for ritual slaughter+ some birds [but gas and head only could be developed further]
 - (--) investments and operating costs + complexity of use of alternatives
- Refining: limit the ban to > 8,000 birds per hour

Electrical prods

- Problems:
 - Legislation lacks clarity
 - Improper design and lack of education
 - Individual restraint for stunning and stubborn animals
- Baseline:
 - Positive evolution since 2009 but no comprehensive data
 - No need for gas stunning in pigs
 - Still needed in few cases

Prohibition of electrical prods

- Description: full ban or further restrictions
- Impacts on the problem
 - +++ for animals
 - A full ban will not solve some situations
- Impacts on stakeholders
 - Risk for workers' safety
 - Additional costs for better design and education (when needed)
- Refining with further restrictions: live weight, only for individual restraint

Simplification and CCTV

- Small slaughterhouses
 - Recording stunning and maintenance
 - Marking date of arrival and maximum number of animals in pens
- Close Circuit Television
 - Compulsory in the UK
 - Widespread in some countries + testing in France
 - Legislation under preparation in Spain
 - Privacy and workers issues

An aerial photograph of a lush green field with numerous cows of various breeds grazing. The cows are scattered across the field, and their shadows are cast on the grass. The text "Thank you" is centered in the middle of the image.

Thank you

