



Brussels,  
KK/fvn agri.e.3(2022)9168607

**MINUTES**  
**MEETING OF**  
***THE EXPERT GROUP FOR AGRICULTURAL MARKETS, in particular concerning***  
***aspects falling under the single CMO Regulation – Animal products***  
***Joint with***  
***MEETING OF CIVIL DIALOGUE GROUP ANIMAL PRODUCTS***  
**21 November 2022**

Chair: AGRI E3 Animal Products

Delegations present for Expert Group: all Member States were present

Delegations present for CDG: All Organisations were present, except Bee Life-European Beekeeping Coordination (Bee Life), Bureau Européen des Unions de Consommateurs (BEUC), EuroCommerce, Eurogroup for Animals, European Federation of Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions (EFFAT), European Forum on Nature Conservation and Pastoralism (EFNCP), European Milk Board (EMB), European Public Health Alliance (EPHA), European Rural Poultry Association (ERPA), IFOAM Organics Europe, Stichting BirdLife Europe (BirdLife Europe)

**Approval of the agenda and of the minutes of previous meeting**

1. **Nature of the meeting** - The meeting was non-public.

2. **List of points discussed**

**2.1 Opening by the chair**

After the kick-off meeting of 10 March (focussing on dependency on imported inputs (energy, fertilisers and feed) under the spotlight of Russia's invasion of Ukraine), two plenary meetings on 6 April and 25 May (that reviewed the sector's socio-economic dynamics) and two further plenary meetings on 4 July and 12 September (that reviewed climate and environment challenges), a 5th plenary meeting of the European Pigeon Reflection Group took place on 21 November to discuss animal health and welfare issues, focusing on ASF, animal welfare and transport as well as on research and innovation.

The reflection was guided by 6 questions:

- **Q1:** What are the main challenges to keep pigs healthy on farm? How important are multifactorial infectious diseases compared to ASF?
- **Q2:** What concrete actions on the farm prove efficient for pig health? What are the most efficient steps to prevent ASF outbreaks in farms?
- **Q3:** Are there measures to prevent citizens from spreading ASF?
- **Q4:** How realistic are the prospects of having a vaccine against ASF? Are the pros outweighing the cons?
- **Q5:** What concrete actions prove the most efficient for animal welfare at farm level? In slaughterhouses? During transport?

- **Q6:** Can animal welfare and farm efficiency go hand in hand?

### **2.1.1. Update on ASF epidemiological situation and EU legislation relating to ASF - DG SANTE**

ASF is one the most challenging global animal health issue the world is facing. The multi-sectorial impact of ASF has severe consequences for the economy and global food security, in particular in Asia. This disease has serious economic implications for pig meat and related sectors, including indirect costs from trade restrictions. The EU undertook a number of initiatives related to ASF. Preparedness, enhanced biosecurity, measures based on science and experience, continuous surveillance, long-term strategies for wild boar management, raising of public awareness, sharing of knowledge and both internal and external cooperation remain crucial for ASF prevention, control and eradication.

### **2.1.2. A farmer's experience (micro-economic approach) - COPA-COGECA**

COPA-COGECA identified a series of challenges to keep pigs healthy on farm: animal diseases (bacteria, virus, parasites), human factor (movement of humans and goods), biosecurity, wild animals, antimicrobial resistance (AMR), reduction in the use of antibiotics, elimination of zinc oxides (ZnO), climate change (vectors). There are several diseases: for example mycoplasmosis, pneumonia, *Streptococcus suis*, *Glaeserella parasuis*, *Lawsonia*, *E. coli*, PCV-2 etc. A number of specific actions can be taken on the farm that prove effective for pig health: prevention (biosecurity), defence (vaccination/immunomodulation), diagnosis (early detection, accurate, laboratorial sensitive test), treatment (antibiotics – as low as reasonably achievable) and depopulation.

COPA-COGECA is of the opinion that the most efficient steps to prevent ASF outbreaks in farms are: eradication of ASF in positive areas, control of backyard production, control animal and products movements, control and decrease wild board density, regional biosecurity, biosecurity at farm level. The most important measure to prevent citizens from spreading ASF by increasing their awareness (avoid feeding wild animals, enhanced biosecurity at all levels). Copa-Cogeca believes that any ASF vaccine should have a high level of protection (>95%), be easy to apply, no recombination and no return to virulence.

### **2.1.3. A Member State's view – Belgium**

ASF was introduced in wild boar in Belgium in 2018. Due to the swift and coordinated action of all concerned authorities and all other involved partners, the disease was eradicated in 2020. ASF had a dramatic effect on Belgian pig prices due to import restrictions of third countries. Even today, 2 years after restoring the free status for ASF in all suidae, some third countries refuse to import Belgian pig products and pig prices are lower than in the neighbouring countries. Measures to prevent the introduction of ASF in pig farms were already in place before the disease was confirmed in wild boar. Additional measures were taken after the confirmation of ASF, such as enhanced surveillance in pig farms and awareness campaigns for pig farmers and veterinarians. A new system of biosecurity scoring of pig farms became mandatory in 2021 in order to enhance the level of biosecurity. The awareness of citizens and especially truck drivers and travellers was raised through brochures destined to all actors and in different languages. ASF is difficult to control when the virus is endemic in wild boar over large areas. An effective vaccine suitable for wild boar would be very helpful.

### **2.1.4. Overview of R&I projects - DG AGRI**

DG AGRI presented an overview of projects linked to pig health and welfare which were financed with EU funds under Horizon 2020 and Horizon Europe. In the field of animal health there are several research domains: emerging/endemic diseases, epidemiology, diagnostic, vaccinology and antimicrobial resistance. In the domain of emerging/endemic diseases two projects were presented: [DEFEND](#) (project addressing the dual emerging threats of ASF and

LSD in Europe) and [PIGs](#) (Program for Innovative Global Prevention of Streptococcus suis). In the domain of vaccinology, four interesting projects were mentioned: [SAPHIR](#) (Strengthening Animal Production and Health through the Immune Response), [VACDIVA](#) (A safe DIVA vaccine for African Swine Fever control and eradication), [REPRODIVAC](#) (Next-generation vaccines and diagnostics to prevent livestock reproductive diseases of worldwide impact) and [SPIDVAC](#) (Novel vaccines for priority farm animal diseases).

DG AGRI presented also one project in the domain of epidemiology – [DECIDE](#) (Data-driven control and prioritisation of non-EU-regulated contagious animal diseases), two projects in the domain of diagnostics – [SWINOSTICS](#) (Swine diseases field diagnostics toolbox) and [VIVALDI](#) (Veterinary Validation of Point-of-Care Detection Instrument) and five on antimicrobial resistance: [HealthyLivestock](#) (Tackling Antimicrobial Resistance through improved livestock Health and Welfare), [ROADMAP](#) (Rethinking Of Antimicrobial Decision-systems in the Management of Animal Production), [AVANT](#) (Alternatives to Veterinary ANTImicrobials), [NeoGIANT](#) (The power of grape extracts: antimicrobial and antioxidant properties to prevent the use of antibiotics in farmed animals) and [DISARM](#) (Disseminating Innovative Solutions for Antibiotic Resistance Management).

Furthermore, DG AGRI informed about two Co-Fund actions: [One Health European Joint Programme co-fund](#) (Promoting One Health in Europe through joint actions on foodborne zoonoses, antimicrobial resistance and emerging microbiological hazards.) and [ICRAD ERA-NET](#) (International effort to fight infectious animal diseases). DG AGRI presented also a role of Secretariat for the International Research Consortium on Animal Health ([SIRCAH](#)) which is funded by the European Commission through Horizon 2020 and is run by a partnership including Defra (UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs), World Organization for Animal Health (OIE), CAB International (CABI), UKRI-BBSRC (Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council), and AnimalHealthEurope (European animal health industry).

Furthermore, DG AGRI informed about five COST Actions (an interdisciplinary research network): [ASF-STOP](#), [ASFLU](#) (swine influenza), [ENOVAT](#), [BETTER](#) and [HARMONY](#). In the field of infrastructure [VETBIONET](#) (Veterinary Biocontained facility Network for excellence in animal infectiology research and experimentation) and [PIGWEB](#) (An infrastructure for experimental research for sustainable pig production) were presented. Moreover, DG AGRI presented [EU Pig innovation Group](#) – project aimed to help pig producers find tried-and-tested best practice from fellow producers across Europe, sharing all new knowledge in one place, on-line. DG AGRI mentioned also the final report of the EIP-AGRI Focus Group on animal husbandry regarding [reduction of antibiotic use in the pig sector](#).

Finally, in the field of animal welfare, DG AGRI presented three projects ([PPILOW](#) on Poultry and Pig Low-input and Organic production systems' Welfare, [Clearfarm](#) on Co-designed Welfare Monitoring Platform for Pig and Dairy Cattle and [aWISH](#) on Animal Welfare Indicators at the SlaughterHouse) and two COST actions ([LIFT](#) and [IPEMA](#)).

### **2.1.5. Example of an ongoing animal health research project**

The project coordinator presented the EU-funded [VACDIVA](#) project - A safe DIVA vaccine for African Swine Fever control and eradication. Total budget foreseen for this project: 10.3 million EUR. There are three main objectives of the project:

1. To provide effective and safe vaccine(s) for wild boar and domestic pigs ready for registration.
2. To develop DIVA test to allow an accurate monitoring of the effectiveness of the vaccine.
3. To design ASF control and eradication strategies in different epidemiological scenarios worldwide and test the pilot vaccine in real environments (including bupigs and warthogs).

Their ambition goal is: a world free of ASF. Field trials will be conducted in Kenya. Large vaccination will probably take place in Asia. VACDIVA is working in several possible locations. Epidemiological modelling of worldwide scenarios will be offered in a portfolio of services to

help animal health authorities control and eradicate the disease. Academic presented a general strategy related to attenuated isolates. There were three LAC vaccine candidates (Lv17/WB/Rie1, NHV/P68 and ASF/ARRIAH/CV-1. Academic showed a lot of enthusiasm and confidence that a vaccine will be available in the nearest future.

### **2.2.1. Two ongoing projects on animal welfare**

PPILOW is a multi-actor project aiming to co-create with end-users innovations for improving the welfare of pigs and poultry in low-input outdoor and organic farming systems. The PPILOW participatory approach involves National Practitioner Groups (NPG) in co-building innovative breeding and rearing strategies and techniques on this purpose. Firstly, the project gathers a comprehensive inventory of the ethical, socio-economic and technical factors that are essential to improve poultry and pig welfare in organic and low-input outdoor production systems, providing a shortlist of potential levers of improvement. The NPGs also co-build and test with PPILOW partners mobile applications (i.e. PIGLOW for pigs) for assessing and benchmarking animal welfare status on-farm, and tools for evaluating the sustainability of the tested lever based on the One Welfare concept. The first strategy studied in pigs focuses on genetics and enrichments allowing keeping fattening pigs in organic and low-input systems without castration, currently applied to prevent boar taint in pork meat. The PPILOW project also aims to propose innovative solutions for favouring positive behaviours, health and robustness through an increased adaptation to organic and outdoor systems for laying hens, slow-growing broilers and pigs (e.g. plant extracts for improving pig health; genetics and farrowing solutions for improving the sow welfare and piglet survival...). The most promising strategies are evaluated through multi-criteria analyses according to the One Welfare concept, and business models are developed. Finally, PPILOW disseminates results widely and facilitates the changes of practices by interacting with the different production chain actors and policy makers at national and European levels. The project PPILOW has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement N°816172.

The aWISH project, which stands for animal welfare indicators at the slaughterhouse. The academic from ILVO presented a concept of the project that stated at the beginning of November 2022 and is financed under the Horizon Europe. There are with 24 partners from 12 European countries and the center of the project is 6 pilot sites. These are slaughterhouses and their supplying chain and stakeholders. They have broiler chickens in France and Poland and fattening pigs in Spain, the Netherlands, Austria and Serbia. In the pilots the installations, data collection, validation and animal welfare assessments will be done. The aim of the project is to develop and offer to farmers, stakeholders and policy makers a cost-efficient and large-scale solution to evaluate and improve the welfare of meat-producing animals. This through centralized, automated monitoring of animal-based welfare indicators at the slaughterhouse. These indicators will allow to give feedback to the various stages of production: farmer, catching team, transporter, and slaughterhouse. An expert panel will be set up for a multi-actor approach (please contact [awish@ilvo.vlaanderen.be](mailto:awish@ilvo.vlaanderen.be) in case of interest). The main aim of the project is to develop an animal welfare indicator catalogue, feedback and benchmarking tool, best practice guides and do animal welfare assessments at farm, chain, regional and national level. Next to that, they will make an environmental and socio-economic assessments of animal welfare issues and their mitigation strategies.

### **2.2.2. Pig welfare within the Farm to Fork Strategy - DG SANTE**

DG SANTE recalled that the EU legislation on the welfare of farmed animals consists of five directives: directive concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes and four Directives laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens, broilers, pigs and calves. In addition, there are two regulations: Regulation on animal transport and Regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing.

As part of its Farm to Fork Strategy, the Commission has already committed to propose a revision of the animal welfare legislation, including on animal transport and the slaughter of

animals. Legislative proposal will be adopted by end of 2023 and will include updated current EU law, new rules, empowerments on other species and animal welfare labelling.

DG SANTE recalled the fact that “The End the Cage Age” initiative was submitted to the Commission in 2020, having gathered 1.4 million signatures. The Commission informed also that the Commission intends to propose to phase out and finally prohibit the use of such cage systems, for all the species and categories referred to in the ECI, under conditions (including the length of the transition period) to be determined based on EFSA opinions, an impact assessment and a public consultation.

DG SANTE informed about the Inception Impact Assessment of July 2021 and contributions received during the 7 weeks feedback period. With regard to current work on Impact Assessment, DG SANTE informed about ongoing external studies on the economic, social and environmental impacts of different policy options. During the open public consultation on the revision of legislation nearly 60 000 contributions were submitted. DG SANTE presented a number of options and issues related to welfare of pigs on farm level, during the transport and at the slaughterhouses that are currently being assessed by the Commission. Finally, DG SANTE presented also which options are assessed for the labelling (regulating animal welfare claims, EU label focused on cage/non-cage, EU label with key animal welfare criteria).

### **2.2.3. The viewpoint of EEB and Compassion in World Farming**

Compassion in World Farming and the EEB gave a presentation on pig welfare with a particular focus on the issues raised by the recent EFSA Scientific Opinion.

Compassion in World Farming and the EEB called for:

- removal of the exception that permits sows to be kept in stalls for the first 28 days of the pregnancy; replacement of farrowing crates by free farrowing pens;
- steps to be taken to ensure that the pig sector is in compliance with the prohibition in the Veterinary Medicines Regulation on routine use of antimicrobials, e.g. early weaning should be ended;
- an end to breeding for large litter size;
- the replacement of surgical castration with immunocastration and the rearing of entire males;
- proper compliance with the legislation that prohibits routine tail docking and requires the provision of effective enrichment.

Turning to slaughter, Compassion in World Farming and the EEB called for a rapid phase-out of the use of high concentrations of carbon dioxide for stunning pigs.

### **2.2.4. A farmer’s perspective – COPA-COGECA**

Copa-Cogeca is of the opinion that Farm to Fork Strategy, the Green Deal and consumer opinion about cage production are the main challenges for pig farming. Copa-Cogeca believes that farmers have a choice and can decide on a method of castration or raising entire males based on their production system and marketing possibilities. A harmonised EU list of available products and protocols for the use of analgesia and anaesthesia are needed. Immunocastration is an option that should be available. Copa-Cogeca believes that any changes to existing farrowing units towards free farrowing pens require: definition of a correct area and confinement time. Free farrowing would need costly investment to rebuild existing stables. There should be no additional bureaucratic burden. The existing building permissions need to cover all the changes that will be necessary to provide loose housing of sows in service units and farrowing units, etc.

Local authorities and municipalities need to support farmers during this transition. Moreover, Copa-Cogeca is of the opinion that raising pigs with intact tails is a challenge. There is a need for more data and studies dedicated to the southern countries. There are obvious differences regarding climatic, feed, management and housing conditions. In case of space allowance, there are several aspects that need to be clarified and taken into account: differences between MS,

costs, impact on environmental licenses and construction authorization. Moreover, the transition period must be appropriate.

### **2.2.5. Challenges and solutions for young farmers – CEJA**

For CEJA high animal welfare means greater benefits for animals, producers, consumers and the society. For farmers, these benefits are related to, among other things: prevention of diseases and related income losses, social acknowledgement, new commercial opportunities. Young farmers presented a series of constraints that need to be considered when requiring higher standards from them: financial and time-related constraints, technical and sanitary constraints. Livestock farming is characterized by long cycles of production and long-term financial investments. Therefore, it is difficult to implement rapid changes.

Young farmers have a limited access to credit and investments. Moreover, the market fails to adequately remunerate animal welfare practices. Animal welfare should be considered and developed in a wide diversity of sectors, species and farms, as there is no one-size-fits-all approach. CEJA believes that ensuring a collective effort along the value chain is a key as well as research, innovation, equipment and knowledge. CEJA is of the opinion that tools are not always fully considered in the framework of the current legislation. Often the cost of investment and knowledge gaps in their use and maintenance are obstacles. Genetic predisposition may also play a significant role. CEJA highlighted an important role that practice-oriented research can play. The lack of veterinaries for farm animals is a challenge in some EU rural areas. It is crucial that MSs guarantee the availability and viability of veterinary practices and support their knowledge. Another important issue mentioned by CEJA was a need for more accurate monitoring of antibiotic use vs. sales. In the context of welfare during the transport, for CEJA it is important to align similar conditions of transport throughout the single market and guarantee a system of Green Lanes for live animals at the borders in times of high traffic. A total ban on live transport or too severe restrictions in terms of travel times would entail heavy economic and social consequences. Nevertheless, CEJA is in favour of improving transport conditions adapted to species and ages and is pushing for a centralised EU control and enforcement mechanism. CEJA is calling for the training of those who manage the choice of animals for transport, with the help of indicators of the welfare of the animals. CEJA is of the opinion that local slaughterhouses must be preserved and there is a need to develop on-farm slaughtering when adequate with farm-scale and local context. CEJA believes that an EU animal welfare labelling should:

- Be voluntary at farm level
- Be co-designed with farmers
- Not aim to penalise farmers not going beyond mandatory requirements
- Guarantee the integrity of the single marker
- Be readable
- Pay attention to the costs and bureaucracy for farmers
- Consider the length of rearing cycles and provide long term certainty
- Include indicators concerning the whole value chain
- Ensure coherence with third countries (trade policy), and
- Be legitimately coordinated by relevant authorities.

Finally, CEJA presented 8 recommendations on the revision of the EU animal welfare legislation:

1. Clarify existing legislation in line with the most recent developments
2. Privilege control and enforcement as the first step towards harmonisation
3. Build up a clear EU labelling certification and monitoring system
4. Maintain a science-based approach in all regulatory steps
5. Support farmers through funding and investment support
6. Promote a greater exchange of knowledge and facilitate the acquisition of skills
7. Upgrade collective action on data collection and monitoring
8. Ensure reciprocity in trade with third countries

### **2.2.6. Challenges and solutions for small farmers – Via Campesina**

Via Campesina is of the opinion that a high level of bio-security is key to keep pigs healthy on the farm. Prevention is better than cure. Measures include: appropriate clothing, control of vehicle entry, adequate facilities (e.g. perimeter fencing), screens on windows and openings, pest management programme, cleaning and disinfection programme, proper disinfection and washing areas, procedure for collection of used medicines and derivatives, water purification equipment, vaccination programme, training for workers. Via Campesina believes that ASF has a mortality rate of 95%, which makes it necessary to close borders to control the spread of the disease. It causes chaos in the market with very serious economic repercussions for the swine sector. ASF cannot be compared to other infectious diseases. The rest has a relative incidence and in no case leads to close borders or poses such a serious economic threat.

Via Campesina informed about three important actions on the farm that prove efficient for pig health and prevent ASF outbreaks, namely: daily care of the animals with a diet adapted to their biological needs, a vaccination plan, a periodical review of the state of the farm facilities. Via Campesina believes that there are concrete measures needed to prevent citizens from spreading ASF. Via Campesina believes that there are realistic prospects of having an effective vaccine against ASF. ECVC is taking part in the research – VACDIVA. In the context of animal welfare at farm level, during transport and in the slaughterhouses, there are three important aspects:

1. Proper functioning of the organism (good nutrition together with excellent animal health).
2. A satisfactory animal state of mind (no negative feelings such as stress or fear).
3. Adequate cleanliness, size, ventilation, lighting and cooling.

Finally, ECVC is of the opinion that animal welfare can go hand in hand with farm efficiency on most EU farms. It is not possible to find an efficient farm without a high degree of animal welfare, marked by the necessary current EU standards.

#### **2.2.7. Challenges and solutions in meat processing - Clitravi**

Entire male and immune-vaccination production are increasing in Europe for welfare reason and sustainability. Near 36 % and 2 % respectively of pigs farmers in Europe adopt these two alternatives to stop castration. The processing pig meat industry needs to adopt new recipes to take account of the lower percentage of fat. The risk of odour needs to be taken in consideration. The boar taint control is implemented in some abattoirs in Europe. The majority of them used human nose methods with 5 levels of odour. Some solutions exist to take in consideration the risk of odour in recipes: dilution, fermentation, masking, association with other positive odours, curing cooking and smoking. For the dry ham industry the use of entire male production is less relevant in relation with very low level of ham fat thickness. Immuno-vaccination or castration is relevant for this part of the processing industry.

#### **2.3 Conclusions by the chair**

The European Pigmeat Reflection Group has now completed its whole series of meetings. A **first draft report** will be shared with members of the group in December. Deadline for introducing track changes will be the end of December 2022. The final report with possible recommendations should be short, concise and easy to read. Members' input will be consolidated in January and the report handed over to the Commissioner on 18 January 2023.

### **3. Stakeholder organisations' and Member States' written contributions**

Two Member States sent a written contribution (PL, NL) and two stakeholders (IFA IE, EEB/Compassion in world farming).

For PL, the main challenges in maintaining healthy pigs on the farm include, first and foremost, adherence to external and internal biosecurity rules. External biosecurity stems from safeguarding the farm against the entry of infectious agents such as, among others, ASF, into the farm. Adherence to internal biosecurity primarily involves inhibiting the chain of infections within various production sectors by following the basic principle: "all room full, all room empty,"

having a fundamental impact on the health status of the herd. From the external biosecurity point of view, it is necessary to identify potential hazards properly. It comprises the purchase of animals and semen, transport of animals, disposal of manure and dead animals, control of feed and water dispensing equipment, farm personnel and visitors to the farm, pests and birds, the environment and the region (including ASF zones) which, uncontrolled, can become gateways on the farm for the infectious agent. Internal biosecurity is related to the control and prevention of disease inside the farm: control of the farrowing and lactation period, management of the piglet houses and fattening houses, observance of rules for animal movement between sectors on the farm and use of equipment after cleaning and disinfection. Inspections of biosecurity requirements are carried out by Polish veterinary services throughout the country on a continuous basis.

Another important issue with regard to ASF is the adherence of hunters to biosecurity rules. Regulation implemented by PL in 2020, specifies the rules that should be observed during hunting and sanitary shooting conducted in areas under restrictions due to African swine fever, as well as outside these areas. Prior to the publication of the regulation, guidelines agreed upon by the Chief Veterinary Inspectorate with the Polish Hunting Association were in effect. An instructional video for foresters and hunters depicting ASF prevention proceedings has been developed on behalf of the Directorate General of State Forests. Moreover, the Chief Veterinary Inspectorate on its website offers access to the training video, as well as other information materials for hunters and foresters. In summary, focusing on the main aspects of biosecurity is a challenge in maintaining healthy pigs on the farm, which must be given the utmost attention.

PL is of the opinion that multifactorial infectious diseases can be eliminated through proper management such as immunoprophylaxis, adherence to basic welfare principles and biosecurity, while in the case of ASF this is impossible, because in the event of an ASF outbreak, herd liquidation is obligatory according to law. There is still no effective vaccine against ASF, and biosecurity is most important in the fight against this disease at the farm level. A prerequisite for the implementation of effective biosecurity is awareness of the need to follow certain rules helping to reduce the risk of infecting animals as much as possible. The awareness can be raised primarily through intensive information campaigns and trainings to make those applying biosecurity rules aware of the purpose for which it is to be followed. The local authorities of the Veterinary Inspection Service, in the framework of their information campaigns on ASF and participation in such actions, regularly perform the above task by the following:

- giving radio, television and press interviews;
- posting information and press releases;
- trainings for veterinarians, pig keepers, hunters, Forest Service employees;
- distribution of leaflets and information materials.

If a person is made aware of the need to comply with biosecurity principles, he or she, first and foremost, consciously wants to implement biosecurity principles and does not feel compelled to comply with them without fully knowing what purpose they are intended to serve. In this context, the element that completes the process of creating a biosecurity system becomes the establishment of appropriate procedural and technical requirements. However, a person who is aware of the role of biosecurity and who wants to comply with its rules will be diligent in implementing the established rules and at the same time, as part of corporate governance, the person will implement additional security measures that do not exclude those already established. PL believes that in order to maintain good health of pigs it is necessary to ensure proper environmental conditions on the farm, i.e. optimal temperature, humidity and ventilation at various stages of production, which has a profound effect on maintaining the health of pigs and significantly affects economic production by reducing the incidence of multifactorial infectious diseases. A concrete and fundamental on-farm action that effectively affects pig health is to reduce the number of sources from which animals are sourced for herd renovation/ introducing new livestock to a farm. An extremely important aspect in maintaining good health of pigs is to acquire pigs only from herds where there is regular serological monitoring of CSF, ASF, Aujeszky's disease and diseases that have a major impact on the economics of production, including mycoplasma pneumonia, porcine reproductive and respiratory syndrome (PRRS),



proliferative enteritis (adenomatosis), porcine streptococcosis, etc. An extremely important aspect is the limited trust during the procurement of animals for herd renovation, which is why quarantine of animals before entering them in the herd and mandatory serological testing to exclude the presence of infectious diseases are recommended. One of the most effective ways to influence the protection of pig health is broadly defined immunoprophylaxis, i.e. the use of vaccines both in the core herd and at various stages of pig production. Given economic considerations, this stage should not be overlooked.

PL is of the opinion that although humans are not susceptible to ASF virus infection, they can be one of the mechanical vectors for the spread of the disease worldwide. It has been repeatedly proven that ASF introductions into remote areas were the result of unaware human activity and failure to follow biosecurity rules. For example, the introduction of ASF into Georgia in 2007, which spread to Europe and continues to this day, is the result of transporting cooking waste on a ship from Africa and feeding it to pigs. Strict adherence to biosecurity principles and a high level of public awareness of the consequences associated with the disease outbreak can stop the further spread of ASF by humans. There are a number of guidelines to curb the spread of ASF, including those related to human activities. People owning pigs should reduce visits by outsiders to their farms to a minimum. Each visit by a veterinarian should involve changing footwear and wearing protective clothing. Pig houses staff should not participate in hunting, keep their own pigs or eat meals in the livestock building area. Disinfection and the use of disinfectants with research-proven efficacy are also crucial. The lack of disinfectant mats at the farm entrance or the lack of disinfection of footwear and equipment, as well as the feeding of food scraps, grass or feed to which wild animals had unprotected access, may have contributed to the introduction of ASF on farms. All these activities should be carried out for the sake of animal welfare and health, protecting them both from ASF and from other pathogens.

For many years, scientists from around the world have been working on a vaccine against ASF. Unfortunately, despite recent media reports of achieving an effective yet safe vaccine formulation, there have been problems in the large-scale application of vaccination. The use of the Vietnamese vaccine preparation NAVET-ASFVAC has been discontinued, as adverse effects have been observed in the form of clinical signs and mass deaths of animals. Although vaccination has resumed, caution should be exercised when introducing formulations for widespread use. History shows that irresponsible use of vaccine preparations can lead to uncontrolled spread of the disease (Spain - 1960s, China - emergence of historic genotype I in the natural environment - 2021). This example shows how challenging it is to develop a vaccine against ASF and how much caution should be exercised before proclaiming success in this field. The most promising candidates for ASF vaccines are live attenuated ASF virus (ASFV) strains, which, due to deletion of virulence conditioning genes, induce immunity in immunized animals. The greatest hopes were placed on the aforementioned vaccine from the US containing a deletion of the *i177L* gene. Currently, several formulations with equally promising results are in the research stage (e.g. Ba71ΔCd2v- Spain, HLJ/18-7GD - China, ΔMGF - Germany). In Poland, the State Veterinary Institute - PIB is undertaking extensive international cooperation, in the form of scientific consortia, to accelerate research on the efficacy and identification of potential vaccine candidates against ASF.

PL is of the opinion that the vaccine against ASF should be characterized by safety of use, high efficacy, the ability to distinguish vaccinated animals from infected ones (DIVA strategy), the possibility of oral delivery to eradicate the virus from wild boar populations, and the possibility of commercial production using continuous cell lines. In addition, the complexity of the ASF virus genome, encoding more than 150 proteins, hinders the development of an effective formulation, through the limited ability to identify potential targets for the use of genetic engineering methods. Many years of ineffective ASF vaccine research around the world prove that creating an ASF vaccine is a complex task. As some scientists point out: the world in the fight against ASF will have to make a choice between allowing the use of a formulation with maximum proven safety and efficacy parameters, or depriving everybody of the possibility of vaccination against ASF. Given the scale of the disease and its consequences, the development of an effective vaccine against ASF, will be crucial for the swine industry, however, this must not

be at the expense of safety and additional risks associated with the uncontrolled spread of the disease.

PL MARD has not conducted studies to assess which of the actions regarding on-farm pig housing, transport and slaughter conditions are most effective for animal welfare.

PL believes that the assessment of which measures are most effective for pig welfare should be carried out by the EC based on scientific opinions from the EFSA. EFSA has recently published a scientific opinion on the housing conditions of pigs, and 5 other scientific opinions on the transport of various species of livestock. Nonetheless, measures that lead to higher levels of animal welfare are those that minimize the stress of using animals for food production. In the case of pigs, one of the most important problems is the stress resulting from a very deficient living environment. Welfare-enhancing measures include providing handling materials and enriching the environment so that pigs can behave, in accordance with the instinct to dig and explore the area, which is very strong in these animals. Increasing the surface of the pen, as well as the area without a grate, where the animals can rest, has a very positive effect. Pigs are very sensitive to high temperatures which is important on the farm but especially in transport. Restricting the transport of animals during hot weather, such as transporting at night, refraining from shipping animals when the temperature exceeds 30°C and reducing loading density is effective for improving welfare levels. It is clear that reducing animal transportation time to a minimum is key to improving welfare in transportation. The most stressful moment for animals is loading and unloading. Therefore, it is important to organize loading and unloading in such a way that the animals have the opportunity to move without haste and without the use of prods by the staff. Organization should also include proper preparation of the place so that the animals do not have to overcome obstacles, e.g. turns, large sloping areas, slippery surfaces, and proper lighting so that the animals do not have to move from brighter to darker areas, which is extremely stressful for them. In slaughterhouses, the above principles should also be applied to the movement of animals within the slaughterhouse. In addition, at the slaughterhouse, it is crucial to carry out proper control of the effectiveness of stunning the animal and control of the absence of signs of life so as to exclude slaughtering conscious animals or treating live animals.

PL believes that the Commission's impact assessment of the planned changes in legislation will take into account economic, social and environmental aspects. Therefore, the introduction of new requirements affecting the increase in animal welfare will be preceded by an analysis of the potential impact of these requirements on farm productivity. It should be noted that the change of current methods of animal husbandry is associated with the need for investment in farms, so it is necessary to provide funding to enable appropriate modernization of farms.

For **NL**, the main challenges of keeping pigs healthy on pig farms are:

- To keep them healthy, both physically and emotionally:
  - Infectious diseases: e.g. PRRSv, influenza, *Streptococcus* spp. and *Actinobacillus pleuropneumoniae* can cause serious health problems.
  - Climate: pig health is very dependent on a healthy climate, and management needs to prevent severe exposure to harmful gases like e.g. CO<sub>2</sub> and NH<sub>3</sub>
  - Stimulation: prevention of boredom is important to avoid tail and ear biting and gain positive wellbeing.
- Trends to keep pigs in higher welfare conditions: The demand for pork derived from animals that lived in higher welfare conditions is increasing in the Netherlands. These animals are more often kept outdoor. This imposes certain new risks for pig health (e.g. risks on biosecurity, parasites).

Currently, endemic infectious diseases and non-infectious diseases have a higher impact in the NL than ASF because ASF is absent in the NL.

NL is of the opinion that biosecurity is the most important action to prevent ASF outbreaks in farms. A clean and dirty route principle, which means a strict and clear distinction between areas where the animals are kept inside the establishment (clean) and outside the establishment (dirty –

where no animals are kept). Access to the ‘clean area’ is only possible through a hygiene lock where changing of clothes (and if possible showering) is mandatory. Food not intended for pigs is not brought into the stables. Contact between pigs inside the establishment and animals from outside the establishment (e.g. wild pigs and pests) is prevented as much as possible. NL informed that In the Netherlands several measures have been taken to prevent the spread of ASF by citizens. Information flyers have been developed and, information about the disease, the impact and ways to prevent introduction is available on the website of the Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (NVWA). Additionally, from 2018, signs have been placed at parking lots and resting areas along national highways and several provincial roads. Especially in regions where there is international (freight) traffic and in regions where wild pig populations are present. At international airports travellers are informed about the risks of spreading ASF through imported pig products. DWHC, the expertise centre for monitoring wild life, regularly puts information on their website. Veterinarians, and professionals are regularly informed about the situation in the EU, the preventive measures and other relevant information via emails, webinars etc.

NL is not very optimistic about the prospects for a useful vaccine on the short term. There are some positive signs from the field and pharmaceutical industries, but the most important aspects of a safe and applicable vaccine have yet to be developed. It is important to make clear what the pig industry needs and in which population we might consider vaccination. Maybe it would be good to consider whether we need a vaccine for application in infected wild boar populations. In the opinion of NL, the most important aspects are the safety (especially when it is an attenuated vaccine), the potential applicability of the vaccine in wild pigs and depending on the target population, the ability to distinguish between vaccinated and unvaccinated infected pigs.

NL is of the opinion that it is difficult to quantify the effect of most actions related to animal welfare at farm level, but NL sees effect of the following actions that took place over the last few years:

- Working group with people that represent transporters, slaughterhouses and primary farms where we work on reduction of the use of instruments which administer electric shocks.
- Animal welfare Officers of the FSA (Netherlands Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority -NVWA) visit each other’s plants to learn from better practices and observe each other’s way of working.
- The use of CCTV cameras in slaughterhouses helps with the enforcement by the FSA. CCTV cameras help even more in securing animal welfare when plants lay down the way of working with CCTV cameras in their own standard operating procedures ( SOP’s).
- The use of artificial Intelligence and sensor technology in combination with CCTV looks promising in being more efficient in identifying situations on the camera footage where animal welfare may have been at risk. However, this still needs to be quantified.
- For non-stunned ritual slaughter: FSA is present permanently and when an animals turns out to be conscious at 40s, it is stunned.
- Farm level: phasing out / forbidding certain mutilation practices, like castration of boar piglets.

For **IFA**, self-isolation of pig units is a main challenge to keep pigs healthy on the farm. Pig to pig transfer of disease biggest vector. Sufficient distance between units allows self-isolation and good external Bio security. Internal biosecurity then is a factor of the immunity of the herd to have resistance to the internal circulating bacteria and viruses. Assisted by vaccination, hygiene protocols and colostrum intake maximization and strategic boosting of Gilt immunity pre-farrowing.

IFA is of the opinion that ASF for Ireland would be disastrous. IE is an exporting country. Multifactorial infectious diseases are very costly but it is possible to recover from them. IE should have special biosecurity protocols that override the “free market” in the interests of a National Island Herd Health Status. Comfortable, warm, clean, well ventilated housing prove efficient for pig health. IFA believes that staff education, isolation, perimeter fencing, vermin and bird proof buildings and closed herds are the most efficient steps to prevent ASF outbreaks in

farms. Citizens' educations at farm/zoo/shows/hobby pig owners are key to prevent citizens from spreading ASF. For Ireland, an Island, information notice at all ports as well as verbal education on transport into the country (Planes and ships) including Northern Ireland. ASF is of the opinion that vaccination is a very last resort. Pig welfare is at the top of every pig farmer's agenda. Listen to the pig farmer when welfare is being discussed. We "live" pig farming every day so there is a balance between pig welfare, economic efficiency and pig farmer welfare. All have equally important status. Animal transport should be as short as possible. There should be adequate space allowance to maximize thermal and physical comfort. IFA is of the opinion that animal welfare and farm efficiency can go hand in hand, once there is balance between them. Farmer welfare and environmental sustainability also should be taken into account as all four are of equal importance. If one dominates, that is when problems occur. It is vital that full impact assessments are carried out when new guidelines and protocols are being introduced.

A classic example of poor EU governance was the law banning piglet tail docking before any clear understanding and assessment of the effects it would have on the four legs of pig farming mentioned above.

NL believes that whether animal welfare and farm efficiency can go hand in hand depends on the measures. For instance improving indoor climate will improve animal welfare and animal health and as a result may lead to improved production and economic results. Another example is rearing entire boar piglets instead of castration of piglets. Boar piglets have a lower feed conversion (less feed needed to gain a kg); and less Co2 emission per reared entire boar.

For **Compassion in world farming and EEB**, the provision that allows sows to be kept in stalls for 28 days after service should be removed. In the current farming systems, sows spend a considerable part of their lives in cages. The EU legislation allows confinement of sows until four weeks after service. However, these sow stalls are linked to serious welfare hazards. By having their freedom of movement as well as freedom to carry out natural behaviours severely restricted, frustrated sows engage in stereotypies and suffer from unresolved aggression, inactivity associated with unresponsiveness which reflects their poor mental state, reduced muscular and bone strength, or reduced cardiovascular fitness. Moreover, individual confinement prevents sows from interacting socially during a period when they are highly motivated to do so (pre-oestrus period and oestrus), which causes them additional stress. Therefore, group housing from weaning offers a number of welfare advantages if well-executed and managed to minimise aggression and meet the welfare needs of sows by maintaining stable groups, as evidenced by a large body of research. According to a 2022 Scientific Opinion by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA), farrowing rate of sows grouped at weaning is comparable to that of sows housed in stalls for the duration of the pregnancy. EFSA recommends that sows should be grouped at weaning to avoid the adverse welfare consequences of stall housing and the possible impact of stress during early pregnancy on reproductive performance. Therefore, there is no justification for the use of sow stalls as aggression of sows can be minimised if they return to groups as soon as possible after any period of separation (e. g. for farrowing and lactation or for service). The use of sow stalls is banned in SE, the UK and Norway and will be phased out in DE by 2030 and in DK by 2035. Other countries like NL or AT have adopted legislation banning the use of sow stalls from 4 and 10 days after insemination respectively.

Compassion in world farming and EEB are of the opinion that farrowing crates should be replaced by free farrowing pens. Likely the strongest behavioural need of a sow is to build a nest prior to farrowing. Pigs' wild ancestors would travel up to several kilometres before finding an ideal nesting site and spent hours building the nest. However, confined in metal farrowing crates, most sows today are only afforded around 1.23 m<sup>2</sup> of space, so they can only stand up and lie down, although not even these movements are without difficulties. Environment-enriching materials such as hay or straw are rarely provided as the floor is usually partially or fully slatted to allow manure and urine to drop down into a slurry pit, meaning that sows spend all the time on a barren floor without any comfortable bedding. No opportunity to perform intrinsically motivated nest building from 24 hours prior to farrowing leads sows to be stressed and frustrated. Farrowing crates were first introduced in the 1960s with a goal to reduce piglet mortality by

controlling sow movements, improve worker safety and save space. The research has shown that while number of crushed piglets is higher in pens with loose housing, the number of piglets dying for other reasons is higher in crates and that when compared, the mortality rate was almost the same in both systems. The main factor influencing piglet mortality is the litter size at birth, age of the sow and season, the former caused by irresponsible selective breeding that has led to sows producing large litters, ultimately increasing the number of piglets that die at birth and weak piglets that do not survive to weaning. The design of crates is often unsuitable for such large litters, however, and piglets may struggle to reach udders. Furthermore, farrowing crates prevent sows from interacting or socializing with piglets in a healthy manner as sows tend to be more aggressive towards piglets in crates as opposed to loose housing systems. Confined sows are also more stressed and restless, which increases the risk of piglets being overlain while trying to suckle. When comparing an individual crate with a pen for farrowing and lactating sows, EFSA concluded the former leads to restriction of movement, restlessness, group stress, and inability to perform exploratory and foraging behaviours, inability to express maternal behaviours, heat stress and soft tissue lesions and integument damage, while none of those applied to farrowing pens. Therefore, EFSA recommends that periparturient and lactating sows are not housed in farrowing crates, but farrowing pens. Those should provide sows with at least 6.6 m<sup>2</sup>, which equates to approximately 7.8m<sup>2</sup> of total pen size, although affording her more space will be linked with positive welfare consequences. It is also recommended that sows and gilts be provided long-stemmed or long-cut straw, hay and haylage in an amount that allows all behavioural elements of nest building to be performed at a functional level. For litter sizes, EFSA concluded that the number of piglets born should be lower than the average number of functional teats, in order to eliminate competition for access to suckling. Sweden, Norway and Switzerland all have years-long experience with free farrowing as they all have banned the use of farrowing crates, with Sweden doing so back in 1987. Other countries that have banned the practice of permanent sow confinement during farrowing and lactation include Austria and Germany, where a deadline for phase-out was set for 2033 and 2036 respectively.

Compassion in world farming and EEB fear that many in the pig sector may not be fully adhering to the above requirements of Article 107 of the Regulation on veterinary medicines. This is because early weaning (at around 24 days of age) remains common in the EU. However, early weaning leads to substantial use of antimicrobials to treat post-weaning diarrhoea. Research shows that weaning at 22-25 days of age, which is common in pig farming, results in 15-20 times higher use of antimicrobials than later weaning at around 35 days of age or more. In Belgium, France and Germany piglets are weaned at around 24 days of age, while in Sweden they are not weaned until 35 days of age. Post weaning antimicrobials use is very much lower in Sweden than in the other Member States. However, early weaning is not the only cause of high use of antimicrobials. Pigs kept in intensive systems tend to need much greater use of antimicrobials than those farmed organically or kept free range. This is borne out by a Joint Scientific Opinion by the European Medicines Agency and EFSA which states: “The stress associated with intensive, indoor, large scale production may lead to an increased risk of livestock contracting disease”. It highlights the need for “rethinking livestock production systems to reduce inherent disease risk”. It states: “measures must be implemented that improve animal health and welfare and thereby reduce the need for antimicrobials in the first place.” A recent study compared the use of antimicrobials in Denmark in pigs farmed organically, free-range (but not organically) and intensively indoors. The results show much higher use of antimicrobials in pigs farmed intensively indoors than in those farmed organically or free range.

Compassion in world farming and EEB are advocating for ending selection for very large litters. Until a few decades ago, the average litter size of sows was nine, but genetic selection has now driven this up to 14 in many countries and to 17-18 in Denmark. The breeding of sows for large litters is a major risk factor for high levels of piglet mortality. Mortality rises with increasing litter size due to a range of factors: low birth weights, variability in piglet weights, a greater percentage of low viability piglets, an increased proportion of crushed piglets, and starvation caused by some piglets being unable to access a teat. EFSA states that piglets without access to a functional teat “will suffer from prolonged thirst and hunger and typically starve to death before they are 4 days old”. Many of the causes of mortality (chilling, starvation, injury and disease),

may also cause suffering in the piglets that survive. Sows with large litters spend longer giving birth and may experience prolonged pain, exhaustion and stress. Sows who raise large litters have to mobilise their body reserves to produce sufficient milk and so are at greater risk of losing body condition. In addition, they have a higher prevalence of painful shoulder sores during lactation as they spend more time lying down. EFSA's 2022 Scientific Opinion recommends: "To avoid excessive competition for access to teats and significantly increased piglet mortality in large litters, the average number of piglets born alive in a given sow breed or line should not exceed, and preferably be lower than, the average number of functional teats in this breed or line". EFSA recommends that "for breeding to be sustainable in terms of sow longevity, selection for litter size should be limited to an average number of 12–14 piglets born alive".

Compassion in world farming and EEB is of the opinion that immunocastration should replace surgical castration. EFSA's 2022 Scientific Opinion states: "Surgical castration without anaesthesia is painful at any age". It recommends that "surgical castration without anaesthesia and analgesia should not be performed due to the severe consequences to the welfare of piglets". It adds: "Under current commercial conditions, immunocastration should be adopted as the preferred alternative to surgical castration. Keeping animals entire should be considered as the next best alternative". Mancini et al (2017) state that "the literature tends to agree that, on average, the costs of immunocastration are balanced by the benefits" such as higher feed efficiency and thinner carcasses. De Roest (2009) concluded that the "benefits from the improvement in feed efficiency compensate for the extra costs of immunocastration" and that "the improvement in feed efficiency may compensate almost entirely for the cost of vaccination". Mancini et al (2017) report on a study carried out by the Food Chain Evaluation Consortium. They state that "the average weighted benefits of immunocastration for the breeder lie between 1.56 and 6.14 €/carcass. The comparison of immunocastration, surgical castration with/without anaesthesia and/or analgesia and rearing of entire males shows that the highest average weighted benefit (between 5.20 and 10.77 €/carcass) is given by entire males".

Compassion in world farming and EEB believe that farmers must comply with the legislative requirement to provide effective enrichment. Many EU pigs have inadequate enrichment material that do not meet the Directive's requirement that "pigs must have permanent access to a sufficient quantity of material to enable proper investigation and manipulation activities". In many cases pigs are just given metal chains or plastic or rubber toys even though studies and the Commission's 2016 Recommendation and accompanying Staff Working Document make it clear that these do not provide effective enrichment and so do not comply with the Directive's requirement. This requirement has been in force for almost thirty years and Member States must now take much stronger action to enforce the legislation on enrichment.

Moreover, farmers must comply with the prohibition on routine tail docking. It is also almost thirty years since the EU ban on the routine tail docking of pigs came into force. Yet the vast majority of EU pigs continue to be tail docked. The legislation on tail docking is a core component of the EU's work to secure good welfare standards for pigs. Respect for the legislation would deliver substantial improvements for pig welfare. A Technical Report prepared for EFSA stressed "an intact curly tail may well be the single most important animal-based welfare indicator for weaned, growing and finishing pigs (at herd level). In addition, it stands for high-quality management and respect for the integrity of the pig". The Federation of Veterinarians of Europe has recently adopted a position paper that stresses the need to move away from tail docking. Scientific studies and the Commission's 2016 Recommendation and accompanying Staff Working Document identify the steps that must be taken to minimise the risk of tail biting.

The 2022 EFSA Scientific Opinion includes the following among the measures that should be taken to minimise this risk:

- Increasing space allowance: for example, tail biting is hugely reduced at space allowances over 1.28m<sup>2</sup> per 110kg pig (EFSA 2022 Opinion, Table 58). In addition, EFSA recommends that space allowances should be increased relative to the current legal requirement to reduce many welfare consequences.

- Provision of a proportion of solid flooring e.g. 0.77 m<sup>2</sup> for a 110-kg pig. Solid flooring makes it feasible to provide effective enrichment materials and lying comfort.
- Provision of enrichment: EFSA states that loose organic materials such as straw, hay and silage are most effective in reducing tail biting. EFSA states: “it is 66–100% certain that a reduction in tail biting can be achieved in undocked pigs if they are offered 20 g per day of straw or similar substrate. However, quantities that are larger (e.g. up to 400 g/pig per day) are more effective”.
- Good air quality: e.g. low levels of ammonia; ammonia should be below 10–15 ppm.

Compassion in world farming and EEB urge the Commission to redouble its efforts to persuade the pig sector to respect this legislation and the Member States to enforce it.

And finally, Compassion in world farming and EEB is of the opinion that use of high levels of CO<sub>2</sub> should be rapidly phased out. A 2020 Scientific Opinion by EFSA stresses that “Exposure to CO<sub>2</sub> at high concentrations is considered a serious welfare concern by the Panel, because it is highly aversive and causes pain, fear and respiratory distress”. It states: “there are no preventive or corrective measures to the pain, fear and respiratory distress caused by the exposure to high CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations as this is inherent to the stunning method.” EFSA recommends that “exposure to CO<sub>2</sub> at high concentration should be replaced by exposure to other gas mixtures that are less aversive”.

These problems have been known about for many years. In 2004 EFSA concluded that at concentrations above 30%, CO<sub>2</sub> “is known to be aversive and cause hyperventilation and irritation of the mucous membranes that can be painful, and elicits hyperventilation and gasping before loss of consciousness”. EFSA recommended that “the gas used to induce unconsciousness should be non-aversive” and stressed that the development of alternative humane gas mixtures was a high research priority. Council Regulation 1099/2009 stresses that it is important for the discussion on phasing out the use of CO<sub>2</sub> for pigs to continue but thirteen years after the adoption of the Regulation no steps have been taken to replace this method with a non-aversive alternative. High concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> continue to be widely used in several Member States. The use of high concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> should be rapidly phased out.

### **3. Next steps**

The Commission asked speakers to send their written contributions after the meeting, if not done before.

### **4. Next meeting**

18 January 2023

### **5. List of participants**

See annex

Pierre BASCOU  
(e-signed)

List of participants– Minutes  
**MEETING OF**  
**THE EXPERT GROUP FOR AGRICULTURAL MARKETS, in particular concerning**  
**aspects falling under the single CMO Regulation –**  
**Animal Products**

**Joint with**

**MEETING OF CIVIL DIALOGUE GROUP ANIMAL PRODUCTS**

**21 November 2022**

<b>BELGIQUE/BELGIË</b> (Belgium)	SPWARNE
<b>BELGIQUE/BELGIË</b> (Belgium)	Vlaamse overheid
<b>БЪЛГАРИЯ</b> (Bulgaria)	Ministry of Agriculture
<b>ČESKO</b> (Czechia)	Ministry of Agriculture
<b>DANMARK</b> (Denmark)	the Danish Veterinary and Food Administration (DVFA)
<b>DANMARK</b> (Denmark)	Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Fisheries
<b>DEUTSCHLAND</b> (Germany)	Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture
<b>EESTI</b> (Estonia)	Ministry of Rural Affairs
<b>ÉIRE/IRELAND</b> (Ireland)	DAFM
<b>ΕΛΛΑΔΑ</b> (Greece)	Ministry of agriculture
<b>ESPAÑA</b> (Spain)	Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación
<b>FRANCE</b> (France)	Ministère de l'Agriculture et de la Souveraineté alimentaire
<b>FRANCE</b> (France)	Agrimer
<b>HRVATSKA</b> (Croatia)	Ministry of Agriculture
<b>ITALIA</b> (Italy)	MIPAAF
<b>ΚΥΠΡΟΣ</b> (Cyprus)	DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE - CYPRUS
<b>LATVIJA</b> (Latvia)	Food and Veterinary Service
<b>LATVIJA</b> (Latvia)	Ministry of Agriculture
<b>LIETUVA</b> (Lithuania)	Ministry of Agriculture
<b>LIETUVA</b> (Lithuania)	Permanent Representation
<b>LUXEMBOURG</b> (Luxembourg)	Service d'économie rurale



<b>MAGYARORSZÁG (Hungary)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture
<b>MALTA (Malta)</b>	Public Abattoir, Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries and Animal Rights, Malta
<b>MALTA (Malta)</b>	Veterinary Regulation Directorate
<b>NEDERLAND (Netherlands)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
<b>NEDERLAND (Netherlands)</b>	Rijksdienst voor Ondernemend Nederland
<b>ÖSTERREICH (Austria)</b>	BML
<b>POLSKA (Poland)</b>	MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
<b>PORTUGAL (Portugal)</b>	MAA-DGAV
<b>PORTUGAL (Portugal)</b>	MAA-GPP
<b>ROMÂNIA (Romania)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
<b>SLOVENIJA (Slovenia)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food
<b>SLOVENIJA (Slovenia)</b>	The Administration of the Republic of Slovenia for Food safety, Veterinary sector and Plant protection
<b>SLOVENSKO (Slovakia)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development of the Slovak Republic
<b>SUOMI/FINLAND (Finland)</b>	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
<b>SVERIGE (Sweden)</b>	Board of Agriculture

<b>Organisations</b>
AnimalhealthEurope
European agri-cooperatives (COGECA)
European Coordination Via Campesina (ECVC)
European Council of Young farmers (CEJA)
European Environmental Bureau (EEB)
European farmers (COPA)
European Liaison Committee for Agriculture and agri-food trade (CELCAA)
Fédération Européenne pour la Santé Animale et la Sécurité Sanitaire (FESASS)
FoodDrinkEurope (FoodDrinkEurope)

**7 Ad hoc experts present**