



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs

Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR
United Kingdom

T +44(020) 7238 6495
Nigel.gibbens@defra.gsi.gov.uk
www.defra.gov.uk

Dr Bernard Van Goethem
European Commission
DG Health and Consumers
Rue Belliard 232B-1040
Brussels
Belgium

Your Reference: Animal Welfare Inspections
Our Reference: AW/EU/2013

30 June 2014

From Nigel Gibbens

Dear Bernard

WELFARE RETURNS REQUIRED UNDER EC/1/2005 (TRANSPORT), 2007/43/EC (MEAT CHICKENS) and 2006/778/EC (ON FARM)

1. I am writing to inform you of the animal welfare controls carried out in the UK between January and December 2013.
2. The arrangements for organising and performing official controls are unchanged since we provided the information for 2012. The UK continues to develop a risk based approach to official controls as required by EC/882/2004.
3. The tables attached provide the information required by EC/1/2005 and 2007/43/EC.
4. Information on animal welfare on farms, including for laying hens, pigs and calves, as required by 2006/778/EC, will be submitted directly using the new online facility.

Yours sincerely

NIGEL GIBBENS

Break down of Inspections by Category - 01/01/2013 - 31/12/2013 - WATO Returns received 152 of 172 submissions = 88%

	Bovine	Porcine	Ovine	Equidae	Domestic Birds and Rabbits	Other Species	Total Number of Inspections
During transport by road	252	27	158	107	7	480	1031
At the place of destination	772	1120	1370	138	141	464	4005
Markets	19678	816	40482	728	211	23471	85386
At places of departure	541	55	616	77	11	921	2221
At staging points	2	0	1	0	0	1	4
At transfer points	2172	414	746	1761	471	21788	27352
Document checks only	259	14	1614	59	0	3656	5602

Relating to Welfare/ Vehicles	Bovine	Porcine	Ovine	Equidae	Domestic Birds and Rabbits	Other Species	Total Number of Welfare Infringements
During transport by road	25	3	13	24	3	55	123
At the place of destination	28	55	35	9	2	10	139
Markets	70	15	205	4	3	65	362
At places of departure	32	9	29	4	9	5	88
At staging points	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
At transfer points	5	0	1	21	0	44	71
Document infringements only	23	11	24	41	0	16	115

	Bovine	Porcine	Ovine	Equidae	Domestic Birds and Rabbits	Other Species	Total Number of Offences
Number of Statutory Notices	9	3	21	22	3	47	105
Number of written warnings	56	19	67	5	5	41	193
Number of oral warnings	91	35	163	25	6	83	403
Number of Home Office Cautions	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Number of Prosecutions	3	0	2	0	0	6	11

ANNUAL REPORT ON THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS DURING TRANSPORT

ANNEX A

Member State: UNITED KINGDOM

Year: 2013

Animals transported (in heads)

	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Bovine	Porcine	Small ruminants	Equidae	(6) Domestic birds & rabbits	Other Species
Slaughtered	2,533,900	10,301,700	14,516,700	5,008	962,140,000	Fig. not kept
Exported (2)	33,824	17,372	499,663	8,165	12,497,580	Fig. not kept
Imported for breeding (3)	46,681	13,386	426	74	8,707,319	Fig. not kept
Other Animals Transported	3,346,810	7,222,915	27,168,847	Fig. not kept	Fig. not kept	Fig. not kept
TOTAL (provisional)	5,961,215	17,555,373	42,185,636	13,247	983,344,899	2,692

Number of inspections

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Total no. means of transport inspected	No. animals covered by inspections	Porcine	Small ruminants	Equidae	Domestic birds & rabbits	Other Species
During transport by road	1,031	9,341	27	158	107	7	480
At the place of destination	4,005	164,536	1,120	1,370	138	141	464
At Markets	85,386	1,314,387	816	40,482	728	211	23,471
At place of departure	2,221	27,037	55	616	77	11	921
At control points	4	32	0	1	0	0	1
At transfer point	27,352	151,930	414	746	1,761	471	21,788
TOTAL	119,999	1,667,263	2,432	43,373	2,811	841	47,125
Document checks	5,602	179,656	14	1,614	59	0	3,656

Number of infringements

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Total no. welfare infringements	Bovine	Porcine	Small ruminants	Equidae	Domestic birds & rabbits	Other Species
During transport by road	123	25	3	13	24	3	55
At the place of destination	139	28	55	35	9	2	10
At Markets	362	70	15	205	4	3	65
At place of departure	88	32	9	29	4	9	5
At control points	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
At transfer point	71	5	0	1	21	0	44
TOTAL	784	160	82	284	62	17	179
Document infringements	115	23	11	24	41	0	16

- (1) Figure relates to the movement of deer in England & Wales
- (2) Figure relates to exports from the UK to the EU (excluding Norway & Switzerland but including Switzerland for cattle only)
- (3) Figure relates to imports from the EU to UK (excluding Norway & Switzerland)
- (4) Figure excludes registered equidae
- (5) Figure excludes game birds for restocking
- (6) Figure relates to poultry only
- (7) Provisional GB figure which excludes racehorses & equidae moved to Ireland
- (8) Figure relates to cattle movements in GB only

Figures are averages based upon the number of animals per movement recorded in Animal Movement Licences & relate to Porcine, S.Ruminants and Deer only

Room 5D
Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London
SW1P 3JR
Telephone 020 7238 6495
Fax 020 7238 5875
Email Nigel.Gibbens@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Website www.defra.gov.uk



ANNEX B

UK ANNUAL REPORT ON THE PROTECTION OF ANIMALS DURING TRANSPORT 2013

Breakdown of Enforcement Action Taken by the United Kingdom in 2013

	Total
Oral Warnings	403
Written Warnings	193
Statutory Notices Issued	105
Home Office Cautions	2
Prosecutions	11

Figures regarding enforcement action taken may relate to more than one infringement discovered during the same inspection.

COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No. 1/2005
ANALYSIS AND ACTION PLAN ON UNITED KINGDOM'S 2013 REPORT ON
ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY

Along with this Return of Enforcement Activity, Article 27 requires Member States to identify the major deficiencies found and an action plan to address them.

We do not have a United Kingdom wide database that identifies the specific deficiencies found in all compliance checks, although we are able to produce the annual report with some qualifications.

The enforcement data in our annual report is produced by the AHVLA Performance Team. The Performance team request the AHVLA Regional Offices together with all the Local Authorities in their area to submit a return on the numbers of Inspections, Infringements and Offences undertaken during 2013. This information is then collated together with information gather from a variety of sources throughout Defra.

An analysis of Annex A shows that, excluding 115 documentary infringements, there were 784 (0.65%) welfare non compliances out of 119,999 inspections. Looking at the reported enforcement actions taken, Annex B, and comparing with reported non-compliances in Annex A, no action was considered necessary in only 70 (9%) of the reported infringements. Of the remaining 714 infringements where some form of action was taken, 403 (51% of all infringements) were fairly minor cases requiring only oral warnings to be given, leaving 311 infringements warranting more formal action ranging from written warnings (193) to prosecutions (11). This more formal action represents just 1.4% of all non-compliances found and 0.26% of all inspections carried out.

Annex D is a breakdown of the reported numbers of compliance checks and non compliances for each AHVLA Regional Office in Great Britain and for Northern Ireland. This shows that the overall United Kingdom non compliance rate is low at only 0.72% compared with 0.88% in 2012. The number of individual offices with a Non Compliance rate of over 5% has also fallen from 18 in 2012 to 13 in 2013.

The offices which exceed 5% non-compliance have indicated reasons for these levels and, where appropriate, how they are addressing or will act to address the non-compliance issues.

The explanations for higher non-compliance rates and appropriate action taken by individual offices are provided below:

1. "There is a high volume of live animals that are transported through ports in the Region. Risk based and intelligence led inspections are carried out at ports which is reflected in the high non-compliance level. Often non-compliances are also identified whilst carrying out work in other areas eg Pets QA checks. Since January 2012 when the import requirements for pets were relaxed, there has been an increase in the commercial transport of puppies

with many of the transporters not complying with WIT legislation. We also attend to referrals from other enforcement agencies working in the portal environment. The increased profile of exports of slaughter/production stock and imports of puppies has resulted in an increase in inspections. Verbal advice is given when a non-compliance is identified and written advice is also sent to the transporter with copies of Notices served to reinforce the requirements of the legislation.”

2. “We do have a through put of Out of County hauliers via our two ferry ports which has influenced the non-compliance percentage. We will look more closely at identifying repeat offenders with the potential for more severe enforcement action case by case. The markets and collection centres are where most non-compliance are detected and we can look at whether the operators are failing in their obligations, which has potential to send out the wrong message.”

3. “Staff to take part in joint regional operations and to inspect slaughterhouse every quarter. It is also hoped that the prosecution will send out a useful message to aid compliance levels locally”.

4. “The instances occurred at our slaughter house and all the farmers have been advised or their local authority informed.”

5. “Much of our work is reactive and intelligence led. This leads to high level of non-compliance. Also our authority carried out a blue light stop with the Police on the A1(M). A high percentage of these checks were carried out on vehicles from outside our region. We also have two abattoirs on the county borders which attract farmers from Bedfordshire and Lincolnshire. To look at reducing the infringement percentage, all non-compliances found on vehicles from outside our region are referred to the Local Authority in which they are based.”

Overall the enforcement actions taken under WATO in the UK resulted in 2 Home Office Cautions issued and 11 prosecutions initiated. The nature of the offences included –

1. One dog arrived at LHR in an aircraft box that was too small
2. One cat arrived at LHR in an aircraft box that was too small
3. Six sheep in very poor condition with foot rot.

Defra Animal Welfare Division
June 2014

Regulation 1/2005 UK Return of Enforcement Activities 2013 - breakdown of Local Area Office activities

	Physical inspections of animals/ vehicles	Document only checks	Total number of inspections carried out	Infringements - excluding document only	Document only infringements	Total number of infringements	% non compliances of total inspections		Number of offices within Region over 5% Non Compliance	
							2013	2012	2013	2012
Ayr	1,782	315	2,097	30	1	31	1.48%	2.33%	0	1
Galashiels	538	42	580	3	2	5	0.86%	0.44%	0	0
Inverness	1,016	0	1,016	11	1	12	1.18%	0.78%	0	0
Inverurie	2,701	0	2,701	3	0	3	0.11%	0.05%	0	0
Perth	1,660	0	1,660	22	3	25	1.51%	1.43%	0	1
Wales	34,056	5,149	39,205	161	15	176	0.45%	0.91%	2	3
Northern Ireland	5,942	0	5,942	34	32	66	1.11%	3.03%	0	0
North	23,496	10	23,506	112	13	125	0.53%	0.49%	4	5
Midlands	15,592	8	15,600	118	6	124	0.79%	0.68%	2	2
South East	25,152	78	25,230	185	32	217	0.86%	0.96%	4	5
South West	8,064	0	8,064	105	10	115	1.43%	1.60%	1	1
Total	119,999	5,602	125,601	784	115	899	0.72%	0.88%	13	18

Time period:
Region: UK

January 1st - December 31st 2013

Data from the Food Standards Agency Operations Group

Table 1. Number of meat chickens inspected in GB slaughterhouses and number and % of birds rejected due to each post-mortem (PM) condition. Comparable data are not available for Northern Ireland

	Stocking Density						Total Number	Total %
	Up to or = 33kg/m ²		>33 to 39kg/m ²		Unknown			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		
1 Number and % of birds inspected	147,381,268	100	530,497,837	100	115,382,738	100	793,261,843	100
2 Number and % birds rejected due to Ascites/Oedema	476,131	0.32%	1,577,705	0.30%	657,902	0.57%	2,711,738	0.34%
3 Number and % birds rejected due to Cellulitis/Dermatitis	251,052	0.17%	1,224,608	0.23%	98,612	0.09%	1,574,272	0.20%
4 Number and % birds rejected due to Dead on Arrival	189,736	0.13%	819,870	0.15%	147,686	0.13%	1,157,292	0.15%
5 Number and % birds rejected due to Emaciation	38,925	0.03%	171,878	0.03%	27,213	0.02%	238,016	0.03%
6 Number and % birds rejected due to Joint lesions	49,506	0.03%	180,933	0.03%	4,002	0.00%	234,441	0.03%
7 Number and % birds rejected due to Septicaemia/respiratory ¹	494,945	0.34%	2,087,700	0.39%	434,225	0.38%	3,016,870	0.38%
8 Number and % birds rejected due to farm-attributed causes ('Total rejections')	1,797,075	1.22%	6,539,860	1.23%	1,465,762	1.27%	9,802,697	1.24%

(1) The category 'Septicaemia/respiratory' includes respiratory disease, hepatitis, pericarditis and peritonitis.

Data from the Food Standards Agency Operations Group (GB) and the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (Northern Ireland)

Table 2. Number of meat chicken batches inspected in UK slaughterhouses, number and % of batches exceeding the Process 1 trigger level for each PM condition¹, and number and % of batches generating Process 1 and Process 2 trigger reports

	Stocking Density						Total Number	Total %
	Up to or = 33kg/m ²		>33 to 39kg/m ²		Unknown ²			
	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%		
1 Number of batches inspected	26,982	100	85,444	100	116,333	100	128,588	100
2 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Ascites/Oedema trigger level	93	0.34%	849	0.99%	347	2.98%	1,289	1.00%
3 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Cellulitis/Dermatitis trigger level	53	0.20%	538	0.63%	20	0.17%	612	0.48%
4 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Dead on Arrival trigger level	127	0.47%	529	0.62%	58	0.50%	749	0.58%
5 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Emaciation trigger level	41	0.15%	350	0.41%	20	0.17%	413	0.32%
6 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Joint lesions trigger level	78	0.29%	401	0.47%	13	0.11%	492	0.38%
7 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Septicaemia/respiratory trigger level	27	0.10%	92	0.11%	20	0.17%	139	0.11%
8 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Total rejections (farm) trigger level	39	0.14%	139	0.16%	43	0.37%	222	0.17%
9 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Mortality rate trigger level ^{3,4}	63	0.28%	202	0.29%	21	0.27%	297	0.30%
10 Number and % batches exceeding Process 1 Foot Pad Dermatitis (FPD) trigger level ⁵	131	3.79%	2,176	10.65%	18	1.93%	2,516	10.14%
11 Number and % batches that generated a Process 1 trigger report ⁶	533	1.98%	4,629	5.42%	456	3.92%	5,859	4.56%
12 Number and % batches that generated a Process 2 trigger report	142	0.53%	604	0.71%	49	0.42%	795	0.62%
13 Total number and % batches that generated a trigger report	675	2.50%	5,233	6.12%	505	4.34%	6,654	5.17%

(1) Only Process 1 data have been broken down by PM condition because Process 2 trigger reports cannot be linked to a single PM condition, and therefore breaking down this data would lead to the multiple-counting of trigger reports.

(2) Stocking densities within this category do not exceed 39kg/m². Producers in Northern Ireland are permitted to stock up to 42kg/m², but no birds were stocked above 39kg/m² during 2013.

(3) The trigger level for mortality rate has been set based on Cumulative Daily Mortality Rates (CDMR) recorded during a pilot study carried out between September 2009 and February 2010. At present not all producers are providing CDMR data in addition to the standard House Mortality (HM) data. When CDMR data are not available, HM data feed into the trigger system instead.

(4) Mortality rate data are not available for mixed-house batches. For this reason mortality data are only available for 98,352 of the total number of batches. Values in the % column have been calculated from the correct denominator for that category.

(5) Foot Pad Dermatitis is scored for all batches processed in Northern Ireland, however in GB it is only scored when the Official Veterinarian suspects that a problem may exist. Therefore the percentages presented (based on amalgamated data) are not representative and are higher than would be the case if all batches, or random batches, had been scored. In 2013 this condition was scored for 24,813 batches in total. Values in the % column have been calculated from the correct denominator for that category.

(6) This is not a sum of the number of batches exceeding Process 1 trigger levels for individual PM conditions because some batches will have exceeded trigger levels for more than one PM condition. Please note that values in rows 11, 12 and 13 relate to the number of batches that have generated a trigger report, rather than to the number of unique trigger reports generated. Previous annual reports have presented the latter values, hence why the current values appear higher than those in the reports of 2010, 2011 and 2012 data.

Time period: January 1st - December 31st 2013
 Region: UK

Data from the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (GB) and the Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (Northern Ireland)

Table 3. Number of trigger reports received and assessed by AHVLA and DARD, and action taken to address the main welfare problems detected

	Number	% of all trigger reports
1 Number of trigger reports received ¹	3231	100
2 Number and % assessed	3128	96.81
3 Number and % resolved following assessment ²	2397	74.19
4 Number and % for which current action under 2007/43/EC is sufficient	952	29.46
5 Number and % for which an Action Plan requested, received and approved	581	17.98
6 Number and % for which an advisory visit carried out	167	5.17
7 Number and % for which an inspection carried out	21	0.65
8 Number and % recommended to reduce stocking density	1	0.03
9 Number and % for which further enforcement action taken ³	2	0.06

(1) The number of trigger reports recorded here is lower than the number of batches generating a trigger report (Row 13 of Table 2 slaughterothou: data) due to the aggregation of trigger reports, particularly those generated by the same farm on the same day.

(2) The classification 'Resolved following assessment' is used where: a) the trigger report is not accurate; b) the trigger report relates to an off-far (e.g. transport) which has been addressed separately; c) the case has received a full veterinary investigation, including contact with the keeper, and has been considered sufficient; or d) an initial investigation has been carried out but has been superseded by the processing of further batches o the same farm that have not generated a trigger report.

(3) Total of 'Notice served', Statement provided for enforcement' and 'Referred for prosecution'.

Table 4. Results of AHVLA and DARD inspections of meat chicken holdings carried out in response to trigger rep generated at the slaughterhouse

	Inspection score	Number of inspections	% of all inspections
1 A: Full compliance with legislation and code		12	57
2 B: Full compliance with legislation but not with code		5	24
3 C: Failure to comply with legislation, no unnecessary suffering seen		3	14
4 D: Unnecessary suffering		1	5
5 Total		21	100