

www.defra.gov.uk

Consultation on

Welfare of animals at slaughter / killing

Proposal for a Council regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing

January 2009

Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London SW1P 3JR
Telephone 020 7238 6000
Website: www.defra.gov.uk

© Crown copyright 2009
Copyright in the typographical arrangement and design rests with the Crown.

This publication (excluding the royal arms and departmental logos) may be re-used free of charge in any format or medium provided that it is re-used accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

Information about this publication and further copies are available from:

Animal Welfare Core Team
Slaughter Regulation Consultation
Defra
Area 8b Millbank
Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London
SW1P 3JR

Tel: 0207 238 5755

Email: animalwelfareconsultations@defra.gsi.gov.uk

This document is available on the Defra website: :
<http://www.defra.gov.uk/corporate/consult/slaughter/>

Published by the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

Contents

Paragraphs

Part I – This Consultation

Purpose	1.1 – 1.4
Previous consultation	1.5
Who is affected	1.6
What will the outcome of this consultation be?	1.7
Consultation deadline	1.8
How to respond	1.9

Part 2 – Current Regulatory Framework 2.1 – 2.4

Part 3 – The Commission Proposal 3.1 – 3.3

Scope	3.4 – 3.7
Comparison with current Directive	3.8 – 3.11

Part 4 – Impact

Sectors and groups affected	4.1 – 4.3
Commission Impact Assessment	4.4 – 4.8
UK Impact Assessment	4.9
Option 1 – do nothing	4.10
Option 2 – Implement Commission proposals	4.11
Cost to Industry	4.12 – 4.13
Cost to Government	4.14
Enforcement Costs	4.15
Benefits	4.16 – 4.17
Summary	4.18
Option 3 – Negotiated changes	4.19 – 4.23
Cost to Industry	4.24 – 4.25
Cost to Government	4.26
Benefits	4.27
Summary	4.28
Option 4 – Implement changes through a Directive	4.29 – 4.30

Part 5 – Summary of Comments requested

Annexes

Annex A – Summary of key assumptions

1: This Consultation

Purpose

1.1 This consultation seeks views from organisations in England (separate consultation will be undertaken in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland) on the Commission proposal to replace Directive 93/119 with a Regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing. We are seeking views on the impact the proposed regulation will have current animal welfare standards. We are also seeking views on the impact on food business operators and others involved in slaughtering or killing animals. These will be used to inform the approach the UK takes in ongoing negotiations in relation to the proposed regulation.

1.2 The proposed regulation will have direct effect in all Member States and all parts of the UK. Implementing rules, codes of practice and guidance notes will be prepared later in accordance with the comitology procedures set out in the proposed Regulation. The Regulation will be complemented by domestic Regulations to define offences, penalties, derogations and other additional provisions necessary to implement the Regulation. Separate implementing legislation will be required in England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. We will consult separately where appropriate on these implementing measures.

1.3 This document:

- Summarises the current regulatory framework
- Describes the Commission proposal and the key changes it will introduce
- Summarises the Commission and UK Impact Assessments
- Requests views

1.4 Also included in the consultation pack are:

- The consultation letter
- The proposed Regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing
- The Commission impact assessment
- The initial draft UK Impact assessment
- A list of consultees

Previous consultation

1.5 Before the proposed Regulation was published the European Commission:

- invited comments on a review of Directive 93/119.
- commissioned reports on stunning and slaughtering practices across the EU.

Copies are available on the Commission website at

http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/slaughter/slaughter_directive_en.htm

In addition the European Commission has published an impact assessment to accompany its proposal. Research undertaken by CIVIC consulting to underpin the Commission Impact Assessment can be accessed at:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/slaughter/report_parti_en.pdf

http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/slaughter/report_partii_en.pdf

Defra has invited initial comments on the proposed Regulation from key stakeholders to inform early Working Group discussions.

Who is affected?

1.6 This consultation is addressed to those with an interest in the welfare of animals at killing including Food Business Operators, Livestock farmers, poultry keepers, animal welfare organisations, veterinary bodies and enforcement agencies

What will the outcome of this consultation be?

1.7 We will consider the views expressed and will reflect these where appropriate in the way we approach negotiations on this proposal. Welfare priorities will be assessed against the criteria set out in the Animal Welfare Delivery Strategy as follows:

- The number of animals affected
- The duration of the welfare problem experienced by each affected animal
- The impact of the problem on the Five Freedoms
- Whether improvement is achievable and measurable
- The impact of disease control measures on animals not affected by the disease

We will also seek to ensure the Regulation adopts a proportionate approach taking account of throughput and business size.

Consultation Deadline

1.8 Comments should be received by noon on 20 April 2009.

How to respond

1.9 Comments should be sent to:

Animal Welfare Core Team
Slaughter Regulation Consultation
Area 8b Millbank
Nobel House
17 Smith Square
London
SW1P 3JR

Email: animalwelfareconsultations@defra.gsi.gov.uk

2: The Current Regulatory Framework

2.1 The welfare of animals at slaughter or killing is currently protected by Directive 93/119 (http://europa.eu/eur-lex/en/consleg/pdf/1993/en_1993L0119_do_001.pdf) of 22 December 1993 on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing. This directive applies to all animals bred and kept for the production of meat, skin, fur or other products. Such animals must be spared any avoidable excitement, pain or suffering during slaughter or killing and related operations inside and outside the slaughterhouse.

2.2 Detailed rules apply to solipeds, ruminants, pigs, rabbits and poultry brought into a slaughterhouse for slaughter or killed outside a slaughterhouse. Animals must either be stunned before killing or killed instantaneously. Stunning is not required where an animal is slaughtered using a method required by certain religious rites.

2.2 Directive 93/119 has been implemented in England by the Welfare of Animals (Slaughter or Killing) Regulations 1995 (WASK) and parallel legislation in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. WASK (a copy is available at http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si1995/Uksi_19950731_en_1.htm) sets out comprehensive and detailed rules regulating the way in which animals are treated during slaughter or killing. These include:

- Requirements that apply to slaughterhouses and knackery yards
- Slaughter and killing outside a slaughterhouse or knackery yard
- Slaughter by a religious method

2.3 Detailed schedules deal with:

- Licensing slaughtermen
- Construction, equipment and maintenance
- Animals awaiting slaughter or killing
- Restraint of animals
- Stunning and killing
- Bleeding or pithing
- Killing pigs and birds using gas mixtures
- Killing horses
- Killing methods for the purpose of disease control
- Killing surplus chicks and embryos in hatchery waste
- Religious slaughter

2.4 A number of amendments have been made to WASK since 1995 to reflect new scientific evidence and other developments where consistent with Directive 93/119.

3: The Commission Proposal

3.1 The Commission proposal

(http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/welfare/slaughter/proposal_en.pdf) takes account of latest scientific and technological developments including two scientific opinions from the European Food Safety Authority¹ and the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE) [guidelines](#) on stunning and killing for human consumption as well as on killing for disease-control purposes adopted in 2005². It also reflects the first Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2006-2010, introducing new concepts such as welfare indicators, the need for further research programs and centres of reference on animal welfare which the Commission adopted in 2006. The Commission has proposed a regulation which will have direct application in the UK and other Member States. However this approach means the UK Government will have limited scope to tailor the regulatory framework further to reflect the specific circumstances that apply in the UK.

Q1 - Will the proposals effectively address current concerns about the welfare of animals at killing?

Q2 - Do you agree a regulation is the best way to ensure the application of common rules and standards throughout the EU?

3.2 A regulation will ensure common rules apply throughout the EU and to Food Business Operators in third countries exporting meat to the UK and rest of EU. This will help create a level playing field and will ensure all Food Business Operators are competing on an equal basis.

Q3 – Will the proposed regulation have a positive or negative impact on the competitiveness of UK Food Business Operators, including their ability to compete effectively in export markets? What is your estimate of the magnitude of that impact?

3.3 The Commission hopes to encourage innovation, ensure better integration of animal welfare in the production process of slaughterhouses, increase the level of knowledge of personnel concerned and improve the protection of animals when large scale killing for disease control purposes occurs. The proposed regulation adopts the approach used in the Hygiene Regulations. It provides a regulatory framework and concentrates on welfare outcomes. It does not specify in detail how those outcomes should be achieved. Responsibility for delivering the required outcomes rests with Food Business Operators (FBOs) and others involved in killing animals. This outcome driven process is very different to the current regulatory framework which sets out detailed technical standards on the assumption that if these standards are met the required welfare outcomes will result.

Q4 - Do you consider the outcome based approach will ensure the welfare of animals is adequately protected and can this approach be enforced effectively?

¹ http://www.efsa.europa.eu/EFSA/efsa_locale-1178620753812_1178620775454.htm and http://www.efsa.europa.eu/EFSA/efsa_locale-1178620753812_1178620773440.htm

² http://www.oie.int/eng/normes/mcode/code2007/en_titre_3.7.htm

Q5 - What are the potential risks to animal welfare associated with a more flexible output based legislative approach and is the level of risk acceptable?

Q6 - What is the nature and value of the business benefits / cost savings that will flow from the output based approach and the ability to develop business level Standard Operating Procedures?

Q7 - Do you support the Commission view that there is a need to increase the knowledge of personnel involved in slaughter / killing operations?

Scope

3.4 The proposed Regulation will apply to all animals killed in a slaughterhouse, on farm or for disease control purposes. It will ensure that animals (including poultry and fish, but excluding reptiles and amphibians) are spared any avoidable pain, distress or suffering. Animals (other than fish) must be killed by a method that leads to instant death or death after stunning. However a proposed derogation will allow slaughter carried out in accordance with religious rites (e.g. Halal or Kosher) to take place without prior stunning (as currently permitted in the UK). Member States can decide not to apply that derogation.

3.5 Chapter II of the proposed regulation sets out a number of general requirements that must be met whenever an animal is killed. These include killing methods, stunning procedures, the introduction of Standard Operating Procedures, certificates of competence for slaughterhouse workers and the use of restraining and stunning equipment.

3.6 Chapter III introduces additional requirements for slaughterhouses. These include rules in relation to the construction layout and equipment in slaughterhouses (which would come into effect on 1 January 2019 for existing slaughterhouses), operational rules for slaughterhouses, monitoring the slaughter process and the appointment of an Animal Welfare Officer in every slaughterhouse (above a minimum size). Chapter IV deals with depopulation (killing animals for disease control purposes) requiring detailed contingency plans and an annual report to be prepared. Chapter V sets out the role to be played by the Competent Authority including the establishment of a National Reference Centre to underpin the operation and delivery of Certificates of Competence.

3.7 Annexes 1 – 4 to the proposal provide further detail on:

- Stunning and killing methods
- Construction layout and equipment of slaughterhouses
- Operational rules for slaughterhouses
- Certificates of competence

Comparison with current Directive

3.8 The Commission have confirmed as a minimum it is their intention to maintain current levels of welfare protection provided by Directive 93 / 119. However the outcome led approach adopted in the proposed Regulation is fundamentally different in conceptual terms to the more prescriptive approach adopted in the current Directive and UK implementing Regulations. This makes detailed comparison between the two approaches very difficult. The core welfare outcomes required under both legislative approaches are the same. In some respects e.g. the need for an Animal Welfare Officer in every slaughterhouse (over a minimum size), the proposed Regulation provides better welfare protection. However the outcome based approach requires plant operators to assume more responsibility for ensuring

the welfare of the animals in their care. Operators are not required to comply with wide ranging detailed technical provisions and have the flexibility to set out how they intend to deliver the required welfare outcomes in Standard Operating Procedures.

3.9 Some of the key differences between the current Directive and the proposed Regulation are set out in the table below:

	Directive 93 /119	Proposed Regulation
Scope	Animals bred and kept for the production of meat, skin, fur or other products	Animals kept for the production food, wool, skin, fur or other products
Application	Movement, lairaging, stunning, slaughter and killing	Killing and related operations (handling, lairaging, restraining, stunning and bleeding)
Animal	All animals	Any vertebrate animal excluding reptiles and amphibians
Animal Welfare Officer	Not required	Required for all slaughterhouses above a minimum size.
Certificate of Competence	Under WASK a licence (certificate of competence) is valid for life. No licence required where the owner slaughters an animal for private consumption.	Certificate of competence must be renewed every five years. Testing must be carried out by an independent body. A certificate will be required by persons slaughtering red meat animals for private consumption.
Standard Operating Procedures	Not required	Required for all killing operations including on farm killing
Electrical stunning	Variable current devices permitted	Constant current devices required after 1 January 2019
Shackle lines	Breast comforters not obligatory	Breast comforters mandatory after 1 January 2019
Restraining and stunning equipment	Must spare animals any avoidable excitement, pain or suffering	As before but, additionally, equipment cannot be placed on the market without instructions on use and maintenance which ensure optimal conditions for animal welfare
Use of restraining and stunning equipment	Person must have the knowledge and skill to perform tasks humanely	Must be operated and maintained by personnel trained in accordance with the manufacturers' instructions
Electrical stunning equipment	Must incorporate an audible or visible device indicating the length of time the stun is applied	Must be fitted with a device to record key electrical parameters for each animal stunned
Reference centre	Not required	National reference centre must be established by every

		Member State
--	--	--------------

Note: this table does not highlight every point of difference and omits differences in relation to detailed technical parameters which the Commission has deliberately omitted as a consequence of its outcome based approach.

Q8 - Taking account of the Commission's preferred approach, please indicate whether you consider the proposed Regulation will ensure all existing welfare protections are maintained and if not what changes are required to maintain current protections?

3.10 The proposed Regulation incorporates transitional provisions in two areas. The new construction, layout and equipment provisions for slaughterhouses will not come into effect until 1 January 2019 for existing slaughterhouses. In addition where certificates of competence are required it will be possible to issue these without examination until 31 December 2014 where the person involved can demonstrate relevant uninterrupted professional experience of at least 10 years.

Q9 – Do you consider that the proposed transitional provisions will give businesses sufficient time to adapt to the proposed Regulation without incurring unreasonable additional costs?

Q10 - Are the welfare concerns such that either or both the transitional periods should be shorter?

3.11 It is envisaged that supplementary guidance will be provided through guidelines. These will be drawn up under the comitology procedures set out in the proposed Regulation. However it is not clear at this stage what if any legal force such material will have.

Q11 – Do you consider Guidelines are an appropriate way to specify detailed technical provisions? Would you prefer to see additional technical provisions (e.g. stun to stick times, live shackling times) set out in legally binding EU implementing regulations?

4: Impact

Sectors and groups affected

4.1 The proposed regulation will impact on the welfare of some:

- 900 million poultry
- 20 million sheep
- 8.5 million pigs
- 2.3 million cattle

slaughtered or killed annually in the UK.

4.2 The regulation will affect all UK Food Business Operators involved in slaughtering pigs, poultry, cattle, sheep and other species. Some 450 slaughterhouses are currently approved in the UK as follows:

- Poultry 101
- Cattle Sheep Pigs 300
- Farmed game (Mainly Deer) 56

4.3 These proposals will also affect farmers (180,000 livestock and 40,000 poultry holdings), knackery yards (350) and others involved in the slaughter of animals outside a slaughterhouse. There will be an impact on companies manufacturing equipment for use in slaughterhouses. Government agencies e.g. Food Standards Agency, Meat Hygiene Service and Animal Health responsible for approving facilities and enforcement activities will also be affected. The proposal will also impact on Government agencies e.g. Animal Health responsible for killing animals for disease control purposes. Finally the potential improvements in animal welfare as a result of the proposed Regulation will have an impact on the welfare of the general public, based on the value the public places on animal welfare.

Commission Impact Assessment

4.4 Following recommendations by the European Food Safety Authority and the OIE to review Directive 93/119 the Commission appointed an external consultant in 2006 to carry out a study of stunning/killing practices in slaughterhouses and their economic, social and environmental consequences. The study was finalised in 2007. At the same time the Commission consulted interested parties and Member States.

4.5 The Commission Impact Assessment considers four options:

- Option 1 - do nothing
- Option 2 - non-binding recommendations
- Option 3 - amending the directive through its technical annexes
- Option 4 – reorganising the legislation

It indicates that slaughtering costs represent a limited part (20%) of the total costs of slaughterhouse activity but acknowledges that increases in those costs could affect the competitiveness of individual companies. However the Commission concludes that changes in costs for slaughtering animals are unlikely to affect the final price of meat significantly.

4.6 The Commission concluded that reorganising the legislation in form of a regulation (option 4) is the only option where innovation can be encouraged and simplification provided (by changing the legal instrument and having a new approach which transfers primary

responsibility for welfare to Food Business Operators). They believe this approach will do more to improve welfare protection for animals than amending the directive (option 3). Option 4 is also seen as the option that is likely to bring the most positive impacts in terms of meat quality, public perception and better working conditions in slaughterhouses. The Commission acknowledges that Option 4 will lead to short term cost increases for certain businesses but notes that these costs will be mitigated to some extent by long transitional periods and exemptions in specific cases.

4.7 The Commission impact assessment suggests that the total EU costs associated with each of its key proposals are as follows:

Cost to operators

	Million Euros / year
Animal welfare officer	18.8 – 27.6
Standard Operating Procedures	20.7
Training for slaughterhouse employees	1.62
Slaughterhouse equipment	0 (Cost written down)

Cost to Government

	Million Euros / year
National Reference Centre	4
Depopulation* reporting procedures	1.9 (one off)
Certificates of Competence	2.5

*This includes killing for disease control

4.8 The Commission suggests that its proposals could help improve meat quality. Production losses in relation to pigmeat EU wide are estimated to be between 60.5 and 140.5 million euros per annum. The Commission estimates that quiet calm handling of pigs could cut losses by around 10% saving some 6 – 17 million euros per annum. They also predict similar gains resulting from reduced bruising in beef carcasses. Losses of between 16.5 and 64.5 million euros are attributed to bruising during the slaughter process. Here a 10% saving would cut losses by between 1.6 and 6.5 million euros per annum.

Q12 – Could the benefits sought by the Commission be delivered in another way? If so how?

UK Impact Assessment

4.9 A separate UK impact assessment has been prepared. Four options have been considered:

- Option 1 – Do nothing
- Option 2 - Implement the Commission proposal as it stands
- Option 3 – Implement an amended proposal that maintains existing welfare protection in current EU / UK legislation and introduces improvements where welfare benefits are proportionate to the costs involved
- Option 4 – Implement an amended proposal as at Option 3 based on a Directive rather than a Regulation

The UK favours option 3.

Option 1 – Do nothing (make no change to existing legislation)

4.10 This option has been included to demonstrate the current position and provide a baseline against which changes can be assessed. If the Commission decides to replace the existing Directive with a Regulation this can be done by majority vote. On this basis, if the UK does nothing, the Regulation could still be put in place. The regulation would be directly applicable in the UK. For these reasons this approach is not recommended and has not been considered further.

Option 2 - Implement the Commission Proposal as it stands

4.11 We could implement the Commission proposals (see section 3) as they stand. This option would introduce a number of changes and new measures including:

- Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) to be prepared at an individual plant level setting out the steps that will be taken to ensure welfare outcomes are achieved
- An Animal Welfare Officer in every slaughterhouse (over a minimum size)
- Certificates of Competence for slaughterhouse workers and farmers slaughtering sheep, cattle and pigs for personal consumption
- Slaughterhouse construction, layout, equipment and operating rules including a move to constant current stunning equipment

Cost to industry

4.12 The following table summarises the costs for the various business sectors involved using the assumptions set out at Annex A:

Sector of Industry	One Off Cost	Recurring Cost Per Year	Annual Cost / Business	
			Large	Small
Poultry Slaughterhouse	£6,304,108	£317,635	£3,356	£2,651
Redmeat slaughterhouse	£15,031,907	£1,110,012	£3,329	£2,625
Knackers yard	£67,413	£299,586	£856	
Equipment Manufacturer	Nil	Nil		
Poultry Unit	£1,348,256	£1,001,364	£72	
Livestock Farm	£10,567,152	£6,756,138	£122	

4.13 The following table summarises costs for each of the specific new measures proposed:

Proposed Change	One Off Cost	Recurring Cost Per Year
Standard Operating Procedures	£7,570,843	£6,180,010
Animal Welfare Officer	£182,343	£225,487
Certificates of Competence	£5,605,650	£3,079,238
Capital Costs	£19,960,000	Nil
Total	£33,318,836	£9,484,735

Q13 - What is the incidence of ineffective electrical stunning at present? Will the introduction of constant current equipment reduce or eliminate this problem and if so to what extent?

Q14 - What role do Animal Welfare Officers play in improving welfare and what are the financial costs and benefits?

Q15 - What is the level / value of existing losses due to poor meat quality attributed to stress or physical damage caused during the slaughter process?

Q16 - What role will reducing stress associated with handling live animals play in improving meat quality and reducing losses?

Q17 – Are the assumptions set out at Annex A valid e.g. in relation to the time taken to complete tasks, the pay scales of those involved and the size of investments required? If not what assumptions should be used?

Cost to Government

4.14 The additional costs to Government associated with the proposed regulation are summarised in the table below:

Proposed Change	One off cost (£m)	Recurring cost (£m) Per year
National Reference Centre	0.08	0.15
Auditing SOPs	0.08	Nil
Slaughterhouse approvals	Nil	Nil
Depopulation procedures	0.15	0.05
Certificates of competence appeals	0.08	0.05
Total	0.39	0.25

These costs assume that the cost of setting up and administering the Certificate of Competence arrangements, training and testing will be met through fees.

Enforcement Costs

4.15 No change in current enforcement costs (£127,000 per annum) is anticipated.

Benefits

4.16 These proposals affect the welfare of almost 950,000,000 animals (including poultry) slaughtered annually in the UK. Many of the benefits associated with welfare at slaughter or killing cannot easily be given a monetary value. Society generally expects animals to be treated humanely and the current regulatory framework reflects this whilst balancing the need for meat to be produced at a reasonable cost to the consumer. Higher welfare standards can improve meat quality and can reduce losses from carcass damage. Some stunning methods e.g. gas stunning of poultry could improve welfare, reduce labour costs, reduce carcass damage and improve meat quality. However the capital investment is about 5 times higher than for an electric water bath stunning system (CIVIC Consulting). Consequently the Commission has decided not to preclude the use of electrical stunning methods. However the proposed regulation can be expected to improve welfare standards through procedural changes and the application of best practice as demonstrated by latest scientific knowledge and technological developments. Livestock production in the UK is worth some £4,400 million annually at farm gate prices. The Commission have estimated that improved welfare at slaughter could give rise to EU wide quality related savings of between 6 – 17 million Euros

per annum in relation to pig meat and between 15.5 and 64.6 million Euros in relation to beef. The UK produces about 4% of total EU pig meat and about 11% of cattle. Applying these proportions to projected EU wide quality related savings implies savings of between £2 million and £7.5 million could be achieved annually in the UK.

4.17 The output led approach will allow Food Business Operators (FBOs) to take more responsibility for welfare within a less prescriptive regulatory regime. They will have more flexibility to establish their own operating procedures so long as they are consistent with the overarching welfare protection provided by the proposed regulation. This will allow FBOs to develop procedures that are sensitive to the needs of their own individual business. At present we have been unable to assess the size of the benefits that will accrue as a result of this regulation. To help quantify this comments are requested.

Q18 – What impact will each of the different aspects of the proposed regulation have on the welfare of animals and what costs / benefits will be associated with each?

Q19 - Do you consider the Commission proposals represent a proportionate approach to achieving improved welfare at slaughter or killing?

Summary

4.18 The Commission proposal lacks detail in some respects and does not maintain current welfare protections in some areas. Further the costs to business, particularly farming businesses, would also increase. This approach is not therefore recommended.

Option 3 – Implement an amended proposal that maintains existing welfare protection in current EU / UK legislation and introduces improvements where welfare benefits are proportionate to the costs involved

4.19 This option is dependent on negotiating changes to the Commission proposal. Under option 3 the UK would implement an amended proposal that ensures the UK's current welfare standards are incorporated into community law. These would apply throughout the EU and to third country slaughterhouses exporting to the EU. Where improvements are introduced the measures adopted would strike an appropriate balance between animal welfare interests and cost to business. We would also seek to ensure the Regulation adopts a proportionate approach taking account of throughput and business size.

4.20 It has been assumed that changes to the proposal to maintain current welfare standards will not impact on costs. However the outcome would also involve the following specific changes to the proposed regulation as described at Option 2 which would reduce costs:

- Constant current water bath – this requirement should only come into effect 10 years after such equipment becomes commercially available
- Standard Operating Procedures - Standard Operating Procedures should not be required where animals are killed, other than small scale killing for human consumption
- Certificates of Competence – A Certificate of Competence should not be required where the owner of an animal slaughters that animal for personal consumption although the general requirement for that person to have an appropriate level of competence would still apply.

In other respects the outcomes, costs and benefits under this option would be the same as for those under Option 2.

4.21 A longer lead in time for constant current water bath stunning equipment will help mitigate some of the one off costs associated with this measure. It is assumed that the period needed to develop the technology together with a 10 year transition period will enable half the poultry slaughterhouses affected to replace their existing equipment in line with existing replacement cycles. This will reduce the cost of this measure from £6m (under option 2) to £3m at present values.

4.22 Exemption from the requirement for Standard Operating Procedures where animals are killed, other than small scale killing for human consumption, will reduce one off and ongoing costs for livestock farms. It has been assumed that this exemption would remove the need for Standard Operating Procedures on all livestock farms and small scale poultry units. It has been assumed that 15% of poultry units (half those covered by the proposed small scale derogation applying to the Animal Welfare Officer requirement) would be exempted as a result. On this basis, for livestock farms the one off cost of preparation and ongoing monitoring costs (£6.1 million and £4.5 million per annum respectively under Option 2) will both fall to zero. For poultry units the one off cost of preparation and ongoing monitoring costs (£1.3 million and £1.0 million per annum respectively under Option 2) will fall to £1.1 million and £0.9 m per annum.

4.23 A Certificate of Competence exemption where the owner of an animal (other than poultry or rabbits which are already excluded under Option 2) slaughters that animal for personal consumption would reduce cost for livestock farmers. The costs associated with this measure would fall from £4.5 million in the first year and £2.25 million annually, to zero in both cases.

Cost to Industry

4.24 The costs to each sector of industry associated with a successfully negotiated Option 3 are summarised below:

Sector of Industry	One Off Cost	Recurring Cost Per Year	Annual Cost / Business	
			Large	Small
Poultry Slaughterhouse	£3,304,108	£317,635	£3,356	£2,651
Redmeat slaughterhouse	£15,031,907	£1,110,012	£3,329	£2,625
Knackers yard	£67,413	£299,586	£856	
Equipment Manufacturer	Nil	Nil		
Poultry unit	£1,146,018	£851,159	£72	
Livestock Farm	Nil	Nil		

4.25 The cost associated with each measure with a successfully negotiated Option 3 are summarised below:

Proposed Change	One Off Cost	Recurring Cost Per Year
Standard Operating Procedures	£1,301,452	£1,523,668
Animal Welfare Officer	£182,343	£225,487
Certificates of Competence	£1,105,650	£829,238
Capital Costs	£16,960,000	Nil
Total	£19,549,445	£2,578,392

Costs to Government

4.26 The additional costs to Government associated with Options 2 and 3 will be the same.

Benefits

4.27 Option 3 removes requirements identified as having only a marginal benefit in relation to maintaining or improving welfare standards under Option 2. On this basis it is assumed that there will be no material difference in the substantive benefits associated with Options 2 and 3.

Summary

4.28 The UK considers option 3 is the best way to ensure current animal welfare protection is maintained and to ensure the costs associated with the proposed regulation are proportionate to the benefits involved.

Q20 – Should the UK seek to negotiate changes to ensure exiting levels of protection are maintained and costs are reduced as described under option 3?

Q21 – Are there any other changes the UK should seek to negotiate to ensure exiting levels of protection are maintained and costs are reduced?

Option 4 – Implement an amended proposal as at Option 3 based on a Directive rather than a Regulation

4.29 It is intended that Option 4 would deliver the same welfare outcomes as Option 3 through a Directive rather than a Regulation. On this basis the costs and benefits for the UK would in most respects the same as those set out for option 3 above. A Directive would allow the UK to maintain and improve on existing welfare standards through implementing regulations. However the standards applying in the UK could as a consequence be different to those applying in other Member States. If UK standards are higher this would put our FBO's at a competitive disadvantage.

4.30 A directive would make it more difficult to introduce an outcome based approach. This would reduce business flexibility and could increase administrative burdens. Further a Directive lacks the flexibility provided by a Regulation to accommodate technological developments in the regulatory regime as they arise. This will result in out of date legislation as is the case for the current Directive 93 / 119 or a more burdensome process to be followed every time an amendment to the new Directive is required. Overall a Directive would not be compatible with Government policy which supports the application of good welfare standards enforced to the same standards internationally. It would also do little to support delivery of Government Better Regulation policies. For these reasons this option is not considered in further detail. Adoption of a regulation supported by guidance and codes of practice (Option 3) addresses most of these concerns.

Q22 – Do you agree with this assessment of Option 4?

Q23 - Does the Impact assessment accurately reflect the additional costs involved with each option and, if not, how should the costs be adjusted?

Q24 – In your view, will the impact of the Commission proposal on animal welfare be significant? Will the impact be positive or negative?

5: Summary of Comments requested

Q1 - Will the proposals effectively address current concerns about the welfare of animals at killing?

Q2 - Do you agree a regulation is the best way to ensure the application of common rules and standards throughout the EU?

Q3 – Will the proposed regulation have a positive or negative impact on the competitiveness of UK Food Business Operators, including their ability to compete effectively in export markets? What is your estimate of the magnitude of that impact?

Q4 - Do you consider the outcome based approach will ensure the welfare of animals is adequately protected and can this approach be enforced effectively?

Q5 - What are the potential risks to animal welfare associated with a more flexible output based legislative approach and is the level of risk acceptable?

Q6 - What is the nature and value of the business benefits that will flow from the output based approach and the ability to develop business level Standard Operating Procedures

Q7 - Do you support the Commission view that there is a need to increase the knowledge of personnel involved in slaughter / killing operations?

Q8 - Taking account of the Commission's preferred approach, please indicate whether you consider the proposed Regulation will ensure all existing welfare protections are maintained and if not what changes are required to maintain current protections?

Q9 – Do you consider that the proposed transitional provisions will give businesses sufficient time to adapt to the proposed Regulation without incurring unreasonable additional costs?

Q10 - Are the welfare concerns such that either or both the transitional periods should be shorter?

Q11 – Do you consider Guidelines are an appropriate way to specify detailed technical provisions? Would you prefer to see additional technical provisions (e.g. stun to stick times, live shackling times) set out in legally binding EU implementing regulations?

Q12 – Could the benefits sought by the Commission be delivered in another way? If so how?

Q13 - What is the incidence of ineffective electrical stunning at present? Will the introduction of constant current equipment reduce or eliminate this problem and if so to what extent?

Q14 - What role do Animal Welfare Officers play in improving welfare and what are the financial costs and benefits?

Q15 - What is the level / value of existing losses due to poor meat quality attributed to stress or physical damage caused during the slaughter process?

Q16 - What role will reducing stress associated with handling live animals play in improving meat quality and reducing losses?

Q17 – Are the assumptions set out at Annex A valid e.g. in relation to the time taken to complete tasks, the pay scales of those involved and the size of investments required? If not what assumptions should be used?

Q18 – What impact will each of the different aspects of the proposed regulation have on the welfare of animals and what costs / benefits will be associated with each?

Q19 - Do you consider the Commission proposals represent a proportionate approach to achieving improved welfare at slaughter or killing?

Q20 – Should the UK seek to negotiate changes to ensure exiting levels of protection are maintained and costs are reduced as described under option 3?

Q21 – Are there any other changes the UK should seek to negotiate to ensure exiting levels of protection are maintained and costs are reduced?

Q22 – Do you agree with this assessment of Option 4?

Q23 - Does the Impact assessment accurately reflect the additional costs involved with each option and, if not, how should the costs be adjusted.

Q24 – In your view, will the impact of the Commission proposal on animal welfare be significant? Will the impact be positive or negative?

Summary of Key Assumptions Used

Businesses affected

Slaughterhouses:

Poultry	101
Cattle Sheep Pigs	300
Farmed game (Mainly deer)	56

Proportion of slaughterhouses working part time:

Farmed Game - 100%

Others – 5%

Knackers yards 350

Farms

Livestock holdings (Cattle Sheep Pigs)	180,000
Poultry Units	40,000
Proportion of farms covered by assurance schemes	65%

Slaughterhouse working hours

Hours worked per day	8
Days worked per week	5
Weeks worked per year full time operation	52
Weeks worked per year part time operation	26

Standard Operating Procedures

Time required to prepare, review and monitor SOPs:

	Slaughterhouse	Knackers Yard	Livestock holding	Poultry unit
Initial preparation of SOPs	1 day	1 day	0.5 days	0.5 days
Additional time for monitoring and recording procedures	15 mins / day	15 mins / day	10 mins / month	10 mins / month
Ongoing updating and review of SOPs	0.5 days per year	0.5 days per year	0.25 days / year	0.25 days / year

Number of businesses affected:

- All slaughterhouses and knackers yards
- Farms not covered by assurance schemes (35% of total)

Hourly rates:

- Initial preparation / annual review - Production manager level - £18.52 per hour
- Maintenance of records - Process and plant operative grade - £8.99 per hour

- Uplift applied to the above hourly rates to cover administrative costs +30%

Animal Welfare Officer

Number of businesses affected:

- Proportion of slaughterhouses exempted by low throughput exemption - 30%
- Slaughterhouses required to have an AWO (450 x 70%) – 315
- Proportion of slaughterhouses required to have an AWO with no AWO at present 33% (315 x 33%) - 104
- Part time slaughterhouses – none (all covered by low throughput exemption)
- Farms / poultry units – none
- Knackers yards - none

Hourly rates:

- Production manager level - £18.52 per hour

Additional time required to undertake AWO role:

- 5% of a full time post

Number of people requiring a Certificate of Competence:

- Proportion of businesses requiring an AWO where existing AWO has 10 years uninterrupted professional experience - 10%
- Number of AWOs requiring certificate only (315 x 10%) - 32
- Number of AWOs requiring testing and a certificate (315 x 90%) - 283
- Number of persons requiring training before assuming AWO role - 104

Costs of obtaining a Certificate of Competence (per person) every 5 years:

Certificate - £50; Testing - £200; Training - £1000.

Certificates of Competence

- Number of active slaughterman licence holders 6000

Number of additional people who will require a certificate of competence:

- Average number of people per slaughterhouse involved in handling and care of animals before restraint – 3
- Total number of people employed in slaughterhouses to handle and care for animals before restraint (3 x 450) – 1350
- Total number of slaughterhouse workers requiring a certificate of competence (6000 + 1350) - 7350
- Proportion of existing licence holders with 10 years uninterrupted professional experience - 50%
- Number of slaughterhouse workers requiring certificate only - 3675
- Number of slaughterhouse workers requiring testing and a certificate – 3675

Staff turnover:

- Proportion of licence holders leaving the industry per annum - 5%
- Number of replacements requiring training, testing and certification (7250 x 5%) – 370 per annum

Livestock farmers slaughtering for personal consumption:

- Proportion of livestock farmers slaughtering for personal consumption 25%
- Number of farmers slaughtering for personal consumption requiring a certificate of competence (180,000 x 25%) - 45,000
- Number of farmers slaughtering for personal consumption requiring a certificate of competence with 10 years uninterrupted professional experience (45,000 x 75%) – 33750

Costs of obtaining a Certificate of Competence (per person) every 5 years:

Certificate - £50; Testing - £200; Training - £1000.