

Pre-testing of animal housing systems

**Legislation and experiences in Sweden,
Switzerland and Germany**

**H.J. Westhoek
H.J.M. Hendriks
A.J. Schutte
P.B. van Tilburg**

Informatie- en KennisCentrum Landbouw/Ede, december 1999

© 1999 Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij

Niets uit deze uitgave mag worden verveelvoudigd door middel van druk, fotokopie, microfilm of op welke andere wijze dan ook zonder voorafgaande schriftelijke toestemming van het Informatie- en KennisCentrum Landbouw, Postbus 482, 6710 BL EDE.

Het Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij stelt zich niet aansprakelijk voor eventuele schadelijke gevolgen die kunnen ontstaan bij het gebruik van gegevens uit deze publicatie.

Oplage 50 exemplaren

Samenstelling H.J. Westhoek, H.J.M. Hendriks, A.J. Schutte en P.B. van Tilburg (DL)

Druk Ministerie van LNV, Facilitaire Dienst/Bedrijfsuitgeverij

Preface

A system of pre-testing of animal housing systems is possible within the Dutch law on animal welfare, but it has not yet been implemented in the Netherlands. In order to gain experience from countries where such a system is already operative, visits to Sweden, Switzerland and Germany were organised. This report describes the systems and their practical aspects in these three countries.

The IKC would like to express its sincere gratitude for the kind hospitality of our Swedish, Swiss and German hosts and for the profound and open nature of the discussions. They prepared the visits very well, not only in the practical sense, but they also thought out very carefully how they could best explain their system and how to show us the most important aspects. The IKC also obtained some very useful written material, which helped us to study some aspects in more detail. Our hosts invested a lot of time in our visit even though they were asked 1001 questions. The visits helped to determine the criteria which a possible system for the Netherlands should meet.

Ir. H.A. Gonggrijp
Head IKC-Landbouw

Contents

1	Introduction	7
2	Sweden	8
2.1	Introduction	8
2.2	The organisation of the Swedish Administration	8
2.3	General information on pre-testing in Sweden	8
2.3.1	The object of testing	9
2.3.2	Procedure	9
2.3.3	Approval	10
2.3.4	Management aspects	11
2.3.5	Financial aspects	11
2.3.6	Cases	11
2.4	Conclusions	11
3	Switzerland	13
3.1	Introduction	13
3.2	General information	13
3.3	The organisation of the Swiss Administration	13
3.4	General information on pre-testing in Switzerland	13
3.4.1	The object of testing	14
3.4.2	Procedure	14
3.4.3	Approval	15
3.4.4	Financial aspects	15
3.4.5	Cases	15
3.5	General recommendations and conclusions	16
4	Germany	17
5	EU-aspects	18
6	General experiences and recommendations	19

1 Introduction

The Dutch law on animal welfare, which was passed by the Dutch Parliament in 1991, includes a section on a system of pre-testing of housing systems for animals. This section has however not yet been put into force. Several studies have been made to investigate whether this system should be put into force (by means of an ordinance) and how this should be done. One of the problems foreseen in the Dutch situation is how to set up a system that is flexible and effective, but at the same time legally precise.

Since some other European countries (Switzerland, Sweden) have systems for pre-testing housing it was felt useful to visit these countries to see how the systems work there and to learn from their experiences. Germany was considering a similar system. Our visits proved very useful. They made it easier for us to see the consequences of possible systems of pre-testing. It turned out that there were substantial differences in approach between the countries, but also a lot of similarities. The visits also taught us that there are considerable differences in the political, legal and societal settings between Sweden and Switzerland on the one hand and the Netherlands (and perhaps Germany) on the other. These differences make it impossible to simply copy a system, however good, from one country to another.

This report describes the systems of pre-testing in Sweden (Chapter 2) and Switzerland (Chapter 3). It also briefly describes the situation in Germany (Chapter 4). In Chapter 5 some EU-aspects are briefly discussed. Chapter 6 gives some overall conclusions.

2 Sweden

2.1 Introduction

In November 1997 three representatives of the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries visited Sweden. The programme included f visits to the Swedish Ministry of Agriculture in Stockholm, the Swedish Board of Agriculture in Jönköping and the Department of Animal Environment and Health at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences in Skara.

Detailed information on the programme and the names and addresses of the experts consulted are given in Annex 2.1

2.2 The organisation of the Swedish Administration

The Swedish Ministry of Agriculture is situated in Stockholm. Since many administrative tasks are delegated to agencies (such as the Swedish Board of Agriculture (Jordbruksverket)) the Ministry itself is quite small (approx. 100 employees).

The Swedish Board of Agriculture is the Government's expert authority on agricultural policies and the industry's authority in the field of agriculture. The Board is situated in Jönköping and has 530 employees.

The Ministry's responsibilities include the drafting of new laws to be passed by the Swedish Parliament. The Animal Protection Act regulates general animal welfare and health. The Ministry is authorised to establish more detailed regulation in the form of an Ordinance. Such an ordinance has the force of a law but does not have to be approved by Parliament. In either the Law or Ordinance responsibilities can be delegated to the Swedish Board of Agriculture. This can be to make more detailed regulation (e.g. on minimum standards for housing) but also the right to approve (or reject) new techniques. Regulation by the Board also has the force of law, but does not have to pass Parliament. The Ministry instructs the Board only in a broad sense. The Board acts independently from the Ministry.

2.3 General information on pre-testing in Sweden

The history of pre-testing new techniques in Sweden goes back to 1973. It then became obligatory to have new techniques tested. However, in 1981 the law was changed, in the sense that there was no longer a legal obligation to have new systems tested. In the period 1981-1988 there were no requests for testing.

The obligatory system of pre-testing was reintroduced in the Animal Protection Ordinance of 1988. The relevant articles of the Animal Protection Act and the Animal Protection Ordinance are included as Annex 2.2. In practice the system started in July 1990. Since then 6 new techniques have been approved (first one in 1993). Testing is presently being conducted for 12 cases. In a few cases early contacts between the manufacturer and the Board have lead to the conclusion that an application had no chance of approval. In these cases no official application was submitted. Annex 2.3 describes the cases which are approved and pending.

In Sweden there are in fact two types of pre-testing. The first is the pre-testing of new techniques, the second is the individual testing of new livestock buildings. This is a check by the County Council to see whether newly constructed or rebuilt buildings comply with all regulations (see section 5 and 6 of the Animal Protection Ordinance).

In Sweden it was stressed that the contacts between the manufacturer, the Board and researchers prior to the actual testing are crucial to good research and therefore form a solid basis for the request for approval.

2.3.1 The object of testing

Which systems are tested?

In general a technique is pre-tested in two different situations :

1. a new technique: when a housing system or equipment is completely new to Sweden
2. a technique which is in conflict with existing regulation

In both cases the Swedish Board of Agriculture decides whether the (new) technique is not harmful to animal welfare or animal health. This does not only include housing systems, other types of equipment with which animals come into contact (e.g. chicken counting machine, milk robot) or influence animal or animal health (e.g. ultra-sonic sound generators, ventilation) can be tested.

When is a technique considered to be new?

There are no written criteria on which it is decided that a technique is considered to be new. This is done on the base of professional judgement by the Swedish Board of Agriculture. As a general rule the new system has to differ significantly from existing systems. The new systems are described in a general way, in order to avoid each minor alteration of the system leading to new testing. In general **principles** are tested, not marks, brands or types. In that respect it differs from the Swiss system, where types are tested.

New systems are sometimes reported by the manufacturers themselves. Another possibility is that the county administrative board, which has to pre-test and approve each newly constructed building "discovers" a new technique, or is not sure whether it is a new technique, or whether the system meets regulations. They contact the Swedish Board of Agriculture. They then decide whether it is a new technique and whether it meets regulations.

A new system is presented to the Board of Agriculture of which the Board knows beforehand that the decision will be negative, the manufacturer is advised not to apply for approval. This was the case for instance with deep litter stables for broilers, because the rule is that the whole stable is cleaned after each consignment. (for hygienic purposes)

Old techniques or systems do not have to be tested. Unless it is clearly stated that they are forbidden (e.g. the electric cow trainer), old techniques are allowed to be used.

2.3.2 Procedure

When a system is marked as 'new' it has to be approved. There are three types of testing:

- cat. I: simple testing (based on professional judgement): can be directly approved or disapproved;
- cat. II literature research, mostly performed by the University. Findings are presented in a report, on which the decision is based;
- cat. III experiments, mostly in practice.

If research is necessary a good research plan is essential.

The Agricultural Board has a standard necessary a good research plan is essential.

In the period 1990-1997 no approvals were given based on simple testing only. Some were in cat. II, most in cat. III however. paper for requests for approval (Annex 2.4). However, this is not generally used.

Testing

If the Board of Agriculture decides that experiments are needed, the manufacturer asks a scientist to make a research plan. The researcher, on looking at the housing system, draws up hypotheses. In order to be able to answer these hypotheses specific questions are posed. A research experiment is set up in such a way that the answers to these questions can be found. This does not mean that a standard set of data is required, but that a selection of the data required takes place beforehand. According to Prof. Algiers, if you just started gathering a lot of data, it would be very difficult to draw conclusions.

This research plan has to be approved by the Board of Agricultural and by the manufacturer. In general, the manufacturer has to pay for the research. In some cases however, the Board of Agricultural finances the research. (This was for example the case for the research on aviary systems, since the government wants to stimulate the research on alternatives for battery systems for laying hens, which will be forbidden in a few years).

At the Department of Animal Environment and Health it was stressed that the research should be set up scientifically (well documented tests, replicable, statistical interpretation). The results are published if wished, in a scientific magazine. The Swedish Board of Agriculture sees testing more as "investigations".

Usually the experiments take a lot of time, because the system needs to be tested by several farmers and/or in several flocks. In general no repeat testings are performed nor are control groups included. Most of the information is gathered during the testing (monitoring) by farmers or researchers. Observations are sometimes also made after slaughter to assess the impact on animal welfare and health.

When data are available from a number of farms one should look for evidence in data to find system-related factors. When looking at one farm only, it is hard to distinguish such system-related factors from other aspects (e.g. management, feed quality, etc.).

Sometimes a new system is already improved during the research period, following the first experiences with the system. This is sometimes done on the recommendation of the researcher. A disadvantage of this might be that the researcher becomes part of the process, and therefore becomes less objective.

Criteria

The criteria for the approval of a system are not written down. Usually the decision is based on professional judgement. The criteria are also very dependent on the type of animals and the technique or equipment tested. In one case (aviary systems for laying hens) the criteria (e.g. on mortality, health, ..) were set beforehand. It turned out to be very difficult to set up such criteria. One of the problems is that the performance of other (old) techniques is not known either. In Sweden this is not regarded as a great problem, because they expect that two systems perform differently at the different parameters. An objective comparison between two systems is therefore not possible. The question is not whether the new system is better (or worse) than an older system, but whether it is good enough.

In Sweden, animal health is considered even more important than animal behaviour. Therefore the testing is focused on both aspects. Some systems are forbidden because of animal health aspects (e.g. deep litter system).

Ethical aspects

In Sweden the public have also started to ask questions about the ethical aspects of housing systems. It is recommended that ethical discussions are guided by an experienced scholar, who is trained in the field of ethical questions.

2.3.3 Approval

The Swedish Board of Agriculture (more specifically: the Head of the Department for Animal Production and Health) decides upon approval of a system. Usually, the report of the researching scientist already includes advice for approval or refusal. The report is discussed in the Animal Welfare Council, in which the Board itself, scientists, animal welfare organisations and farmers are represented. Sometimes a report is discussed in the referee group (also from the Agricultural Board, organised per species) as well.

In theory, it would be possible for a manufacturer whose system is not approved to go to court to fight this decision. In practice, this has never happened. Nor is it very likely, because even if a manufacturer wins the case, the new system would not be accepted by the Swedish farmers and Swedish public.

2.3.4 Management aspects

The pre-testing is focused on the design of housing techniques, and not on management aspects. Nevertheless, management is a very important factor for animal welfare. In one case the Board did take management factors into account. In Sweden, it is forbidden to keep broilers in higher densities than 20 kg per m². Farmers argued that with good management it was possible to raise the density up to over 30 kg per m². Now a system has been approved in which a controller checks each broiler farm individually. The design of each shed, management and health aspects of each farm are evaluated according to a standard procedure. Points can be scored for each element. If a farm scores 100% it may raise the broiler density up to 36 kg per m².

2.3.5 Financial aspects

Research costs vary enormously, mainly depending on the extent of the research required. It differed from Skr 10000 for the ultra-sound device to millions of Skr for research into an aviary system. In some cases the research is (partly) paid by the government (through the Agricultural Board).

An application to the Swedish board itself costs 4000 Skr (1 Skr is approx. NLG 0,25)

2.3.6 Cases

In order to illustrate the system of pre-testing two examples will be briefly discussed:

Aviary system

At the manufacturers' request, three types of aviary systems for laying hens are being evaluated. In order to test the system a number of farms (more than 15) are equipped with this system. A number of behaviour and health related parameters are being monitored, such as feather pecking, death, growth, production etc. Contrary to all other pre-tested systems, in this case minimum standards were set for each parameter. The levels for these standards were chosen only after a long discussion. The testing of the systems is still continuing. The testing was hampered by a number of unforeseen events (e.g. wrong kind of feed, different hybrids). Preliminary results show that values for a number of parameters surpass the pre-set limit (high mortality, cannibalism, feather pecking). The flocks tested were not beak trimmed, since this is to be banned in Sweden.

Broiler catching machine

A broiler catching machine has also been evaluated. In the beginning the idea of a machine for catching broilers met with emotional resistance. The testing of the broiler catching machine showed that the machine caused more injuries than manual catching, but gradually the number of injuries was reduced. This could be explained by the increasing experience of the staff operating the equipment. The differences between automatic and manual catching were not very great. The Board of Agriculture approved the catching machine, after stipulating that some speed regulations be made and that they could monitor the future trend of injuries for a period of time.

2.4 Conclusions

Broadly speaking, our hosts had the following experiences and recommendations concerning the system of pre-testing:

- the combination between regulation and pre-testing works very well (Board)
- it is important to clearly define what is considered to be a new technique (Board)
- test principles, not brands, types or details (University), keep the system simple (Board)
- the approval should not be done by scientists, and not by interest groups either. It should be a neutral person or commission (Board)
- do not only look at the hardware, but take management into account as well (University)

- set up a good research plan containing hypotheses and concrete questions ; it is however not necessary to research every parameter. The research itself should meet generally accepted standards on quality of research. Be pragmatic (University).
- also take ethical questions into account. Discussion on ethics should be guided by an expert in this field (University).
- do not use fixed criteria; make an open system and do not try to regulate everything beforehand

In general:

- education of farmers is necessary, it requires skills to keep animals; civil servants also have to be trained so that they can perform their controlling tasks well (University)

3 Switzerland

3.1 Introduction

In January 1998 three representatives of the Netherlands Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries visited Switzerland (Annex 3.1). Their programme consisted of a visit to the two locations of the Swiss Federal Veterinary Office where the system of pre-testing is managed. These centres are based on testing stations. One is in Zollikhofen (for poultry and rabbits) and one in Tänikon (for cattle and pigs).

Detailed information on the programme, the names and addresses of the experts consulted are given in Annex 3.1

3.2 General information

Since Switzerland is not an EU-member, it can to some extent determine the economic conditions for their farmers. Due to agreements within the GATT Switzerland has to open its borders for agricultural products from other countries. The prices of some products (e.g. eggs) are still high, but prices are decreasing. Instead of general price compensation to the farmers, compensation now more often takes the form of cross-compliance, e.g. in return for better performances for environment, nature conservation or animal welfare.

The maximum number of animals (except cattle) which could be held at one farm were regulated a number years ago (according to species). This has now been relaxed, but this has not led to a large increase in the numbers of animals per farm. In general, agricultural holdings in Switzerland are relatively small. For example, a flock of 5000 laying hens can provide 20-25% of a farm's income.

3.3 The organisation of the Swiss Administration

Switzerland is a federal state, where the cantons are fairly autonomous. The Swiss Ministry of Economic Affairs to which the Federal Veterinary Office belongs, is based in Bern. Annex 3.2 gives an overview of the Swiss Administration.

When the system of pre-testing of housing techniques was put into force in 1981, the Swiss Government decided to base two special branches of the Federal Veterinary Office on two testing stations, and to assign the implementation of the pre-testing system to these branches..

New laws have to pass Parliament. An ordinance (Verordnung) has to be accepted by the Swiss Government (Bundesrat).

3.4 General information on pre-testing in Switzerland

The system of pre-testing housing systems (and parts of housing systems) was introduced in 1981. In 1978 a law was passed which contained a general article on pre-testing (Bundesgesetz 9.5.1978, article 5). In 1981 an ordinance was drafted which elaborated the system of pre-testing (Verordnung 27.5.1981, article 27-30). The text can be found in Annex 3.3. In Switzerland there are minimum standards for certain aspects of animal housing systems. The system of pre-testing is an addition to these minimum standards.

Farmers see the pre-testing more as an assurance that housing systems comply with the minimum standards and that they are approved with respect to animal welfare. They generally do not consider the system of pre-testing as interfering regulation.

Since the beginning of pre-testing in 1981, 2057 applications have been made. Of these, 1055 have been approved and 42 have a temporary approval. A total of 721 requests have been withdrawn, because it was clear that they would not receive approval. Only 13 requests were officially turned down. It was not clear whether an appeal against a negative decision is possible. A third party appeal against a positive decision (e.g. by an animal protection organisation) is not possible.

3.4.1 The object of testing

Which systems or equipment are tested?

In Switzerland all mass-produced housing systems and relevant parts of housing systems (feeding and drinking equipment, floor, mats, nests etc.) must be approved by the Swiss government prior to introduction. The approval is only necessary when the article is sold or advertised. This means that small-scale import by a farmer of housing systems or parts is allowed.

When no complete housing systems are mass-produced for a particular species (e.g. dairy cows), it means that approval is not needed. Parts of the housing system (e.g. cubicle divisions) still have to be approved. It was stressed that even if all parts are approved, it is still possible to build a bad housing system. For those animals where there are no mass-produced housing systems, the minimum standards must still be respected. In Switzerland (in contrast to Sweden) existing types of systems and equipment also had to be approved.

The manufacturer receives an approval for each type of system or equipment. When alterations are made within a certain type, these have to be reported by the manufacturer to the Swiss Veterinary Office. This does not however always happen.

3.4.2 Procedure

When approval is necessary for a complete system or for a part or equipment the manufacturer or importer contacts the office of the Federal Veterinary Office. They send back a form which the applicant has to fill out. On receipt the Veterinary Office decides whether the application meets the minimal standards, and they assess whether the application can be simply approved (e.g. close similarity to previous requests, literature research, or no reason to doubt the request) or that experimental research is necessary. In most cases parts and equipment are approved without practical testing. Completely (new) housing systems are generally tested. When research is needed, this is usually paid for and performed by the research stations.

When the research is ready (c.f. section Testing), the staff officer (Dr. Oester or Dr. Wechsler) decides upon approval. The complete procedure can be seen in Annex 3.4. The system is guided by a commission (Commission on Housing systems), but this commission does not take decisions on approval of individual requests.

Testing

If it is felt that experimental testing is necessary, the staff makes a proposal for research. This proposal is discussed with the manufacturer and may be changed. Then the system is installed in the testing facilities in Zollikofen or Tänikon. It is preferred that the system is also tested on two or three farms, so that the system can be evaluated under practical conditions. It is not necessary for the research results to be evaluated statistically. This would require far too much experiment (replications, controls etc.) which would render the research too expensive. The research lay-out should however meet scientific standards (replicable, standardised conditions etc.).

Some examples of systems which were tested in Tänikon are:

- open air housing for pigs, with shelters which were semi-enclosed by plastic flaps where it was warm enough for the pigs. Outside area for feeding and excretion;
- new devices for sludge feeding of pigs, which allowed more pig per feeding place than officially prescribed;

- a new cow trainer, where the cow first touched a wooden section to warn it, in order to prevent an electrical shock.
- a housing system for sows with piglets, in which the sow was not tethered. Space requirement per sow was 5.5 - 7 m².
- a feeding system for cows, in which the cows could go outside to the silage to eat. The silage was protected by a fence, which the cows had to push slowly forward in order to reach the silage.

The last two tests are not in the framework of pre-testing, but are more fundamental research.

Criteria

A system or part of a system has to comply with the minimum standards which are set per species. In addition, an evaluation is carried out for each individual request.

There are no fixed or set criteria to determine whether a system can be accepted or not. Article 1 of the Animal protection ordinance gives some general statements about housing conditions: "animals shall be kept in such a way as not to interfere with their bodily functions or their behaviour, or overtax their capacity to adapt" "feeding, care and housing shall be deemed suitable where it meets the animals' requirements , according to existing experience and the state of knowledge concerning physiology, animal behaviour and hygiene
In general, the systems are evaluated on the basis of a number of animal welfare and health parameters. These parameters depend on the species, and the system or part of a system under evaluation. The Veterinary Office has to prove that a system cannot be approved. It is easier to accept a system than to refuse it.

3.4.3 Approval

On the base of professional judgement, literature research or practical research, the staff officer responsible decides upon approval. There is also the possibility for an approval for a limited time. This is done when a system is still under evaluation, or when it is expected that no major problems will occur. In this way a delay is avoided for the manufacturer. The manufacturer has to inform the farmer that his system has only limited approval. In practice this could mean that in the definitive approval some minor changes to existing systems are required.

3.4.4 Financial aspects

For each approval a modest fee has to be paid. This fee depends on the part or system which is approved. For small articles (e.g. drinking nipples) the fee is approx. 1-5 Sfr. For a complete housing systems this is Sfr 9500.

3.4.5 Cases

Open housing for pigs

In Tänikon pen housing for pigs was under research. In this system the pigs live in semi-open unheated housing. Feeding, excretion and other activities were done outside. The pigs could shelter and sleep in large boxes, which were only open at the front. This open side was covered by plastic flaps, so these boxes were relatively warm (lowest temperature in winter 15 °C). The advantages of this system are low costs of the building, but also the stall climate (fine dust, ammonia concentrations) was better than in closed (traditional) housing. Research was focused on this stall climate, animal behaviour and growth performance. No decision has yet been taken on approval.

Sludge feeding of pigs

In Switzerland there is regulation on the number of pigs per feeding place (5:1 in the case of ad lib feeding). In the case of sludge feeding the pigs can eat more quickly, so that a ratio of 12:1 could be possible. Research is being conducted to see how the pigs behave when there is only one feeding place for twelve pigs. Frequent observations are made concerning pigs behaviour (e.g. aggression). When the results show that is possible, it will be allowed. It is then seen as a specification (not an official alteration) of the minimum standards.

3.5 General recommendations and conclusions

- as for the advantage of pre-testing (above minimum standards) in Switzerland it is felt that minimum standards cannot take new developments into account. Furthermore, with pre-testing it is clear to farmers whether a system/part is allowed or not;
- The advantage of the Swiss system is that an overview of all system and parts on the market is obtained, because all manufacturers must report their systems and parts;
- the original idea was to put a mark ("approved") on each part or system. This idea was abandoned for practical reasons.
- contact between the researchers, the Veterinary office and the manufacturer prior to testing is essential. All have to agree with the research plan;
- the research has to be limited to the major aspects, generally being ethological aspects and animal health. In a research plan priorities have to be set;
- if the system were to be set up again, it is doubted whether parts would be included. The main questions concern whole housing systems;
- It is difficult to take management aspects into account in the pre-testing systems. No systems should be allowed which rely too heavily on management skills.

4 Germany

In Germany there is no legal system (yet) for the pre-testing of new housing systems. A proposal for such a system has been accepted by the Bundesrat, but this proposal was not accepted by the Bundestag.

In Germany the DLG (Deutsche Landwirtschafts Gesellschaft) tests parts of housing system, e.g. feeding equipment, stall mats and cubicle divisions. Manufacturers can ask the DLG to test their equipment. The DLG then tests many aspects of the equipment, including the technical aspects (strength, quality) but also animal welfare aspects. If the equipment is approved, the manufacturer may stamp this equipment "DLG approved", which is recognised by German farmers as a quality mark. The manufacturers have to pay the DLG a testing fee. This fee ranges from DM 3000 to DM 25000, depending on the size and testing costs involved. In general, these fees cover only 20-30% of the total costs. The rest is subsidised by the German Government.

The DLG promotes so-called group testing, i.e. a number of manufacturers send in their equipment (e.g. stall mats) to be evaluated as a group. The DLG does not evaluate complete housing systems. In general only equipment for pig sheds and cattle is tested. The manufacturers of equipment for poultry husbandry are not interested in having their equipment tested.

For each type of equipment there is a commission which is responsible for planning the test and criteria to be used. This results in a proposal for each test. This proposal is discussed beforehand with the manufacturers. They can suggest changes, but it is the commission which takes the final decision on the research plan.

For animal welfare there are no fixed parameters or fixed criteria. For each part of equipment the commission determines how this should be evaluated for animal welfare.

A working group will be set up in which a number of experts on animal welfare will participate. This working group will work for all technical commissions in order to help them to set up research plans for the evaluation of animal welfare.

One interesting outcome of the testing was that 80% of the equipment submitted was altered (improved) during the testing period, because of the preliminary results of the testing. This applied mostly to the technical aspects, but also to animal welfare aspects.

5 EU-aspects

The question is whether the pre-testing of new techniques should be allowed within the EU, since it may be seen as a kind of trade barrier. The Swedish position is that it is not a trade barrier, but pre-testing is necessary to protect animal welfare and health. The legislation focuses on animal health and welfare, and not on the technique. Furthermore, it is not the trade or import of material which is forbidden, but the use of certain techniques by farmers.

A complaint about the system of pre-testing has been filed in Brussels. The Swedish Government has responded to questions from the Commission about this.

6 General experiences and recommendations

Our experiences in the three countries visited lead to the following conclusions:

- only in Switzerland and Sweden is there a legally based system of pre-testing;
- these systems operate under conditions that are quite different from the Dutch situation. These differences are:
 - the nature of agriculture in these countries;
 - the way society regards agriculture and the way farmers deal with their responsibility;
 - the legal environment in which these systems function;
- The above mentioned points make it possible to have a very pragmatic system, which does not have to be "court-proof".
- Both in Switzerland and in Sweden the system of pre-testing is combined with minimum standard for the housing of animals;
- In Sweden only new housing systems have to be pre-tested. In general only complete systems are evaluated; Testing is at the level of "principle" of a housing system and not at the level of type or brand. This has led to 18 applications in the last seven years;
- In Switzerland both housing systems and relevant parts have to be pre-tested. This has led to approx. 1200 approvals in the last 15 years. Only a small number of these approvals is based on experimental testing. In most cases, approval is given on expert judgement.
- In both countries it was felt that the main tension between animal welfare and other aspects (e.g. economy) concerns the housing system and not parts;
- In both countries it was stressed that management is a very important factor for the actual well-being of the animals. It was acknowledged that this factor is very hard to take into account in testing hardware.

Annex 2.1

Programme Sweden

- 26.11.1997 Meeting at the Ministry of Agriculture with:
- Ingrid Mossberg, Head of Section Animal welfare
phone +46 8 405 12 26
fax +46 8 20 64 96
e-mail Ingrid.Mossberg@agriculture.ministry.se
- Anna Tofftén, Legal Adviser
Åsa Donell, co-ordinator of EU-affairs
Annelie Rosell, Market regulation milk and milk products
- Flight to Jönköping
- 27.11.1997 Excursion to a small scale slaughter house and to a dairy farm
- Meeting at the Swedish Board of Agriculture
S-551 82 Jönköping
- Mr. Christer Nilsson,
phone +46 36 15 51 79
fax +46 36 30 81 82
e-mail Christer.Nilsson@sjv.se
- Mr. Björn Dahlén
- 28.11.1997 Visit to the Department of Animal Environment and Health, University of Agricultural Sciences, Skara
- Meeting with Prof. Bo Algers, Lotta Ekstrand and Jan Svedberg
- Prof. Bo Algers Ph.D.
phone +46 511 672 00
fax +46 511 672 04
E-mail Bo.Algers@hnh.slu.se
- Lotta C. Ekstrand
phone 46 511 672 07
E-mail Lotta.Ekstrand@hnh.slu.se

Annex 2.2

Annex 2.2 (Continued)

Annex 2.3

Annex 2.3 (Continued)

Annex 2.4

Annex 2.4 (Continued)

Annex 3.1

Programme Switzerland

- 15.1.1998 Visit to Bundesamt für Veterinärwesen,
Prüfstelle für Stalleinrichtungen, Hausgeflügel und Kaninchen
Burgerweg 22
CH-3052 Zollikofen
- Dr. H. Oester
tel. +41 31 915 35 15
fax. +41 31 915 35 14
E-mail Hans.Oester@bvet.admin.ch
- 16.1.1998 Visit to Bundesamt für Veterinärwesen,
Testing Station for Animal Housing Systems
(including extensive visit to the testing facilities for cattle and pigs)
- Dr.B. Wechsler
tel. +41 52 365 11 90
fax. +41 52 368 31 31
E-mail Beat.Wechsler@fat.admin.ch

Annex 3.2

Annex 3.3

Annex 3.3 (Continued)

Annex 3.3 (Continued)

Annex 3.3 (Continued)

Annex 3.4

Annex 3.5

Netherlands Delegation

Peter van Tilburg (Sweden and Switzerland)
Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries
phone +31 70 378 5732
fax +31 70 378 6161
e-mail p.b.van.tilburg@DL.AGRO.NL

H. Hendriks (Sweden and Germany)
Information and Knowledge Centre
phone +31 318 671 561
fax +31 318 624 737
e-mail h.j.m.hendriks@IKCLB.AGRO.NL

Arjan Schutte (Switzerland)
Information and Knowledge Centre
phone +31 318 671 487
fax +31 318 624 737
e-mail a.s.schutte@IKCLB.AGRO.NL

Henk Westhoek (Sweden, Germany and Switzerland)
Information and Knowledge Centre
phone +70 318 671 502
fax +31 318 624 737
e-mail h.j.westhoek@IKCLB.AGRO.NL

