

# Competitiveness of the UK egg sector, base year 2021

International comparison of production costs

P.L.M. van Horne and N. Bondt



# Competitiveness of the UK egg sector, base year 2021

International comparison of production costs

P.L.M. van Horne and N. Bondt

This research has been commissioned by the British Egg Industry Council (BEIC).

Wageningen Economic Research  
Wageningen, September 2023

---

REPORT  
2023-119  
ISBN 978-94-6447-881-5

---

Horne, P.L.M. van, N. Bondt, 2023. *Competitiveness of the UK egg sector, base year 2021; International comparison of production costs*. Wageningen, Wageningen Economic Research, Report 2023-119. 42 pp.; 23 fig.; 8 tab.; 15 ref.

Companies in the UK egg sector have to comply with legislation on animal welfare, food safety and environmental protection. Whereas the legislation aims to guarantee comprehensive high quality production, it also confronts the sector with additional costs. Countries outside the UK do not have the same extensive legislation. This report presents the results of a study on the competitiveness of the UK egg sector. The production costs for eggs and egg products are calculated for the UK and several EU and non-EU countries. Different scenarios are outlined to illustrate the impact of changes in import levies and exchange rates.

Key words: competitiveness, eggs, egg powder, production costs, international trade, UK, EU

This report can be downloaded for free at <https://doi.org/10.18174/638592> or at [www.wur.eu/economic-research](http://www.wur.eu/economic-research) (under Wageningen Economic Research publications).

© 2023 Wageningen Economic Research  
P.O. Box 29703, 2502 LS The Hague, The Netherlands, T +31 (0)70 335 83 30,  
E [communications.ssg@wur.nl](mailto:communications.ssg@wur.nl), <http://www.wur.eu/economic-research>. Wageningen Economic Research is part of Wageningen University & Research.



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.

© Wageningen Economic Research, part of Stichting Wageningen Research, 2023

The user may reproduce, distribute and share this work and make derivative works from it. Material by third parties which is used in the work and which are subject to intellectual property rights may not be used without prior permission from the relevant third party. The user must attribute the work by stating the name indicated by the author or licensor but may not do this in such a way as to create the impression that the author/licensor endorses the use of the work or the work of the user. The user may not use the work for commercial purposes.

Wageningen Economic Research accepts no liability for any damage resulting from the use of the results of this study or the application of the advice contained in it.

Wageningen Economic Research is ISO 9001:2015 certified.

Wageningen Economic Research Report 2023-119 | Project code 2282300605

Cover photo: British Egg Industry Council

---

# Contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Summary</b>	<b>6</b>
S.1 Executive summary	6
S.2 Complementary findings	7
S.3 Methodology	8
<b>1 Legislation</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 Introduction	9
1.2 UK/EU Legislation	9
1.3 Costs of alternative housing systems	10
1.4 Economic impact of legislation	12
1.5 Situation in some third countries	13
<b>2 Production costs of eggs in the UK and selected EU countries</b>	<b>16</b>
2.1 Production costs of <i>enriched cage</i> eggs	16
2.1.1 Production costs at primary farm	16
2.1.2 Production costs of egg powder	18
2.2 Production costs of <i>barn</i> eggs	18
2.2.1 Production costs at primary farm	18
2.2.2 Production costs of egg powder	20
2.3 Production costs of <i>free range</i> eggs	20
2.3.1 Production costs at primary farm	20
2.3.2 Production costs egg powder	22
<b>3 Production costs of eggs in selected non-EU countries</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 Production costs of cage eggs	23
3.1.1 Production costs at primary farm	23
3.1.2 Production costs of egg powder	24
<b>4 Results of different scenarios</b>	<b>25</b>
4.1 Description of the scenarios	25
4.2 Shell eggs	25
4.2.1 Basic situation	25
4.2.2 Scenario 1 - Lower import levies	27
4.2.3 Scenario 2 - Lower exchange rates	28
4.2.4 Scenario 3 - Combination of lower import levies and lower exchange rates	29
4.2.5 Scenario 4 - Combination of zero import levies and lower exchange rates	30
4.3 Whole egg powder	31
4.3.1 Basic situation	31
4.3.2 Scenario 1 - Lower EU import levies	33
4.3.3 Scenario 2 - Lower exchange rates	34
4.3.4 Scenario 3 - Combination of lower import levies and lower exchange rates	35
4.3.5 Scenario 4 - Combination of zero import levies and lower exchange rates	36
<b>5 Conclusions</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Sources and literature</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>Appendix 1 Main assumptions in different housing systems for layers</b>	<b>41</b>

---

---

# Preface

Companies in the UK egg sector have to comply with legislation on animal welfare, food safety and environmental protection. Whereas the legislation aims to guarantee a comprehensive high quality product, it also results in the sector facing additional costs. An example of retained EU legislation is Council Directive 1999/74/EC regulating minimum standards for the housing of laying hens in enriched cages, barn and free range systems. Most countries outside the UK do not have the same extensive legislation. At the same time the UK is involved in bilateral trade negotiations with different partners – among them India, Canada, Mexico, Israel and the Gulf Cooperation Council - which are intended to further liberalise trade by reducing or abolishing import levies. The Free Trade Agreement with the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) is a recent example of this. The UK egg sector is concerned about the consequences for its competitiveness.

In this report Wageningen Economic Research, an independent research institute of Wageningen University & Research in the Netherlands, presents the results of a study on the competitiveness of the UK egg sector. This report is an update of Van Horne (2019). The production costs for eggs and egg products are calculated for the UK and several EU and non-EU countries using data from the year 2021. Different scenarios are outlined and their effects are calculated to illustrate the impact of lower levies and changes in exchange rates. Data of the EU countries are based on a report on the competitiveness of the EU egg sector (van Horne and Bondt, 2022).

The project has been initiated and funded by the British Egg Industry Council (BEIC). We thank BEIC for their cooperation.



Prof. dr. ir. J.G.A.J. (Jack) van der Vorst  
Managing Director Social Sciences Group (SSG)  
Wageningen University & Research


# Summary

## S.1 Executive summary

In this report the impact of reducing or removing import levies on the competitiveness of the UK egg sector is studied, for both shell eggs and whole egg powder. For shell eggs, it is not expected that the import from third countries to the UK will become substantial, because of the costs of transportation and the effect on product quality and safety. In contrast, for whole egg powder, severe competition from third countries can be expected if import levies are reduced or removed.

Current UK import levies on whole egg powder provide protection for the UK egg sector. This protection for the egg sector is necessary, because egg powder from the Ukraine and the USA is barely more expensive than the UK domestic product, even with import levies. In a scenario with 50% lower import levies, all selected third countries have a lower offer price of whole egg powder<sup>1</sup> compared to the UK egg sector.

Figure S.1 provides the offer price of whole egg powder in the UK,<sup>2</sup> compared to Ukraine, the USA, Argentina and India. The offer price is the price at which whole egg powder can be offered in Birmingham, and includes primary production costs, transportation costs and import levies. Figure S.1 shows that import levies protect the UK egg sector from large volumes of imports from third countries, because the offer price of whole egg powder with the current import levies from most non-EU countries is above the offer price of UK producers. However, egg powder from the USA and Ukraine could almost compete, despite the full import levies. The offer price of egg powder from the USA and Ukraine is only 2% above the level of the UK processors.




**Figure S.1** Offer price in Birmingham of whole egg powder from enriched cage system eggs produced in the UK (horizontal line) and conventional cage system eggs produced in Ukraine, USA, Argentina and India in pence per kilogram in 2021.

<sup>1</sup> After the removal of the shell and drying of the egg contents.

<sup>2</sup> It is noted that the UK has only recently recommenced producing egg powder.

Figure S.2 illustrates the 'worst-case scenario' with no import levies and a 10% devaluation of the exchange rates for the non-EU currencies. Offer prices in Birmingham were estimated to be 21% (Argentina) to 27% (Ukraine) and 28% (USA) below the offer price from UK producers. In this scenario all four selected non-EU countries would be very competitive suppliers of whole egg powder to the UK market. Large volumes of whole egg powder can be expected to be imported from these countries.



**Figure S.2** Offer price in Birmingham of whole egg powder from enriched cage system eggs produced in the UK (horizontal line) and conventional cage system eggs produced in Ukraine, USA, Argentina and India in pence per kilogram in 2021, without import levies and 10% lower exchange rate of the third countries' currencies compared to the UK pound.

## S.2 Complementary findings

The production costs of shell eggs produced in enriched cages in the UK in 2021 was on average 90 pence per kg of eggs. Between the main egg-producing countries in the EU, the production costs of shell eggs in 2021 ranged from 83 pence per kg of eggs in Poland and the Netherlands to 87 pence in Germany. Compared to the cost level in the UK, the production costs for shell eggs in 2021 were lower in Argentina (-19%), India (-20%), Ukraine (-24%) and USA (-26%).

For whole egg powder the non-EU countries were also competitive. Compared to the average level in the UK, the production costs of whole egg powder in 2021 were lower in the USA (-24%), Ukraine (-21%), India (-20%) and Argentina (-17%). Because the costs of transportation of powder are low after the liquid content is removed, the offer price of whole egg powder from third countries is relatively low. However, current import levies protect the UK egg sector from imports from non-EU countries.

In the UK, egg producers have to comply with retained European legislation covering environmental protection, animal welfare and food safety. The additional costs directly related to European legislation are estimated to be 14% of the total production costs of eggs at farm level. Most of these additional costs are because of enriched cages (additional living space and other enrichments).

In Argentina, India and Ukraine there is no legislation on animal welfare and laying hens are housed in conventional cages with a space allowance of 400 to 450 cm<sup>2</sup> per hen. In the USA there is no federal legislation on laying hen welfare. Between countries, regions and farms the stocking density differs due to climate and management strategy. Table S.1 gives an overview of the regulations and political and societal interest of environmental, food safety and animal welfare issues in the four selected non-EU countries.

**Table S.1** Regulation in selected non-EU countries (Ukraine, USA, Argentina and India)

	Political and societal interest	Regulations in place	Situation in practice
Environment			
-Manure disposal	Medium	Differs a)	Most farmers receive revenues from manure
-Ammonia emission	Low	No	No measures taken to limit emission
Food Safety			
-Zoonosis control	Medium	Differs b)	Action different per country/company
-Meat-and-bone-meal	Low	No	Meat-and-bone-meal is used
-GMOs	Low	No	All GMOs are allowed to be used
Animal Welfare			
-Stocking density	Low c)	No c)	High density in conventional cages

a) Regulations in some regions, for example in the USA; b) Regulations in some countries, for example in the USA or only export-oriented companies; c) In the USA the market is changing towards non-cage eggs. Some states (e.g. California) already have legislation.

## S.3 Methodology

Egg producers in the UK have to comply with retained EU legislation dealing with environmental protection, animal welfare and food safety. This legislation results in an increase in egg production costs. After the UK left the EU ('Brexit') the UK started negotiations with non-EU countries with the aim of liberalising trade in agricultural products. In this report, Wageningen Economic Research studied the impact of reducing or removing import levies on the competitiveness of the UK egg sector.

The production costs of shell eggs and whole egg powder were calculated for the UK, seven EU egg-producing countries: Germany, France, the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, Denmark and Poland and four additional non-EU countries: Ukraine, USA, Argentina and India. In all twelve countries, data were collected on prices (feed, young hens), technical results (egg production, feed intake, mortality), investments (poultry house, cages) and other costs (interest rate, labour, manure disposal). For egg processing, data were collected on investments in buildings, equipment and labour costs. The base year for the data was 2021. The total costs were converted to pound sterling (GBP) with the average exchange rate in the year 2021. Account was taken of the implementation of enriched cages in the EU, being the minimum standard for egg production since 2012.

Based on the 2021 situation four scenarios were analysed:

- 50% reduction in import levies for eggs and whole egg powder, to illustrate the result of any multi - or bilateral agreement.
- 10% lower exchange rate of the third countries' currencies compared to the pound sterling (GBP).
- Combination of a 50% reduction in import levies and 10% lower exchange rates.
- 'Worst-case' scenario based on no import levies and 10% lower exchange rates.

---

# 1 Legislation

## 1.1 Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of legislation in the UK/EU.<sup>3</sup> Poultry farmers and other food business operators in the production chain in the UK/EU have to comply with this European legislation. This legislation is the translation of societal and political choices made in the UK/EU and its standards and demands may exceed international standards and practices. Most UK/EU legislation relates to environmental protection, animal welfare and food safety. Section 1.2 gives an overview of the most important legislation. Section 1.3 presents the additional costs of alternative housing systems for laying hens. Section 1.4 presents the economic impact of the legislation while Section 1.5 gives a short overview of the current situation of (animal welfare) legislation in some third (non-EU) countries. Although all links in the supply chain are confronted with legislation, this chapter mainly focuses on the situation and consequences at farm level.

## 1.2 UK/EU Legislation

Egg producers in the UK/EU have to comply with a set of European legislation. This legislation mainly relates to environmental protection, animal welfare and food safety. In this section, UK/EU legislation directly relevant to the egg sector is briefly presented. It should be noted that some EU Member States choose to go beyond EU standards by implementing more stringent national or regional legislation. This national legislation is not, or just briefly, discussed in this chapter. In a report of the European Parliament an overview is given of EU legislation related to the livestock sector (Chotteau et al., 2009).

### *Environmental protection*

The UK/EU has taken measures to limit the pollution of land, water and air. The main environmental legislation affecting poultry production in the UK/EU is the Nitrates Directive (91/676/EC). The Nitrates Directive aims to control pollution and protect water quality, by preventing nitrates from agricultural sources from polluting ground and surface waters and by promoting the use of good farming practices. The Nitrates Directive forms an integral part of the Water Framework Directive and is one of the key instruments to protect waters against agricultural pressures. The Directive has established action programmes to be implemented by farmers, such as limitation of fertiliser application and/or a maximum amount of livestock manure that can be applied per hectare per year (170 kg of nitrogen). Some countries have additional national environmental legislation to limit manure spreading to certain periods or specific soil types. This is especially relevant in areas with a high concentration of pigs and poultry, such as the south and east of the Netherlands, Flanders in Belgium, Bretagne in France, Catalonia in Spain, and the Po valley in the north of Italy. Because of this legislation, poultry farmers in these regions have to pay for the disposal of manure (van Horne and Bondt, 2017).

In the UK/EU, all poultry farms which exceed a threshold size of 40,000 bird places are requested through legislation to hold an environmental permit (Directive 2010/75). Operators are required to carry out activities in compliance with their environmental permit and they must use 'Best Available Techniques' (BAT) to achieve a high level of environmental protection (ADAS, 2016). The aim of the Directive is to apply the best available techniques to prevent or to reduce ammonia or other emissions to air, land and water from these activities, since pollution from poultry houses need to be controlled. In Directive 2011/92 it is regulated that poultry farms need to have an Environmental impact assessment (EIA). This is required for all larger farms. Smaller farms may also require such an assessment at the discretion of the Member State. A fee is charged to cover the costs of the assessment. The Directive also requires an odour or noise management plan in case of potential odour or noise complaints (van Wagenberg et al., 2012). In addition, Directive 2001/81/EC gives National Emission

---

<sup>3</sup> It is noted that Northern Ireland continues to comply with EU legislation under the Northern Ireland Protocol. GB continues to comply with retained EU legislation at the present time.

---

Ceilings to ammonia emission for every EU Member State. Some EU Member States, such as the Netherlands and Germany, have additional national regulations to reduce ammonia emissions from poultry houses.

The UK and EU countries have to meet maximum limit values for certain substances to ensure air quality, following Directive 2008/50/EC. The Directive offers extension periods to comply with the maximum limit values based on conditions and the assessment by the European Commission.

#### *Food safety and public health*

The European legislation on animal feed (e.g. Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003) provides a framework to ensure that feedstuffs do not endanger human or animal health. The legislation sets rules on the circulation and use of feed materials, requirements for feed hygiene, rules on undesirable substances in animal feed, legislation on genetically modified food and feed, and conditions for the use of additives in animal nutrition. The consequence is higher costs for poultry feed. A large proportion of protein sources for poultry feed is imported from outside the UK/EU. An increasing share of world production of soya crops is from genetically modified hybrids. The asynchronous EU approval of GM crops, coupled with the operation of almost zero tolerance, is negatively affecting the UK/EU supply of feed ingredients (Backus et al., 2008), resulting in higher feed costs.

Foodstuffs of animal origin may present microbiological and chemical risks. Such risks require the adoption of rules of hygiene, traceability and labelling. For the egg sector, the Zoonoses Directive is especially relevant. Zoonoses Directive 2003/99/EC and Regulation 2160/2003 regulate sampling, monitoring and control measures. Between the UK and other EU Member States, there is a large variation in Salmonella prevalence. In response to the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) baseline study, the UK and each EU Member State had to make a plan to reduce the Salmonella prevalence in laying flocks.

#### *Animal welfare*

The UK and all EU Member States have ratified the European Convention for animal protection with principles relating to animal housing, feed and care appropriate to their needs (98/58/EC). The aim is to prevent animals from all unnecessary suffering in three main areas: farming, transport and slaughter. Minimum standards are established to protect and to avoid competition distortions between producers in the UK and EU Member States.

In the UK and EU, all mutilation is prohibited (annex of Directive 99/74/EC). However, to prevent feather pecking and cannibalism, the UK and EU Member States may authorise beak trimming provided it is carried out by qualified adult staff on chickens that are less than 10 days old.

Especially relevant for the egg sector is Directive 99/74/EC, laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens. The welfare Directive required that from 1 January 2003 the space allowance per hen in conventional cages increased from 450 cm<sup>2</sup> to 550 cm<sup>2</sup> per hen. From 2012, the use of conventional ('battery') cages was banned. Laying hens can only be kept in enriched cages or alternative (non-cage) systems. The enriched cage gives each hen 750 cm<sup>2</sup> surface area, increased cage height, a perch, a nest box and litter. This change towards enriched cages has large consequences for the sector, resulting in high additional costs; the impact of this Directive is discussed in Section 1.3.

## 1.3 Costs of alternative housing systems

The welfare Directive 99/74/EC required that from 1 January 2012 laying hens are housed in enriched cages or in alternative (non-cage) systems. The alternative system described in the EU Directive most resembles the barn/aviary system. Four different housing systems can be distinguished:

- Enriched cages

In comparison to conventional battery cages, the group size is enlarged. The enriched cage gives each hen 750 cm<sup>2</sup> surface area, increased height, a perch, a nest box and litter.

- Barn/Aviary systems

This system is based on floor accommodation (comparable to barn housing) whereby via levels, the hens can also use the vertical space in the house. Each hen has 1,100 cm<sup>2</sup> of usable area, part of the surface area of the house is covered with litter and in the house, there are enough nest boxes and perches for the hens.

- Free range systems

The housing system is the same as for barn/aviary systems, but in free range systems, the birds have access to the outside range area during daylight hours.

- Organic systems

In organic systems the usable area per hen in the poultry house is larger than in free range systems. The outside area is minimum 4 m<sup>2</sup> per hen. Furthermore, in organic the 17-week pullets (additional rules in rearing) and feed (organic feed ingredients) are much more expensive.

To calculate the additional production costs of eggs we compare five different housing systems: a conventional cage with 550 cm<sup>2</sup> per hen (as is still allowed in third countries), an enriched cage, the barn/aviary system, free range and organic. Based on results at research stations, field data of layer farms in different countries and expert opinions, assumptions were made on labour input and investments for conventional cages, enriched cages, barn/aviary, free range and organic. It is evident that increasing the space allowance per bird will lower the bird density per m<sup>2</sup> of poultry house. As a result, the investment for housing and equipment will increase. For the enriched cage and the barn/aviary, the labour needs and investments for house and equipment per hen place are higher. Table A1.1 in Appendix 1 provides the details. Field data of layer farms show no major differences between the conventional and the enriched cage regarding egg production. In barn/aviary systems egg production is slightly lower and feed intake is higher than in the cage system. Table A1.2 in Appendix 1 provides the details.

The costs for housing and equipment are calculated for all housing systems. The other variable costs are also calculated for each system (electricity, litter, etcetera). Revenues for spent hens are presented as negative costs. Table 1.1 provides the results. In enriched cages the costs are higher for other variable costs (because of the use of litter material), housing and labour. In the barn/aviary system all cost components are higher. In the enriched cage, the production costs compared to conventional cage (with 550 cm<sup>2</sup> per hen) are 5% higher, in barn/aviary +21%, in free range systems +42% and in organic systems this is +125%.

**Table 1.1** Production costs (in pound sterling) for various housing systems for laying hens (situation UK, prices 2021)

	Conventional cage	Enriched cage	Barn/Aviary	Free range	Organic
Costs per hen housed:					
Hen (pullet at 17 weeks)	3.70	3.70	4.08	4.19	6.26
Feed	13.82	14.06	14.77	14.33	23.11
Other variable costs	1.07	1.10	1.17	1.39	1.69
Housing	2.12	2.93	3.31	3.13	4.66
Outdoor area	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.90	0.99
Labour	1.14	1.22	2.13	3.23	6.21
General costs	0.34	0.36	0.57	0.85	1.48
Revenue spent hen	-0.25	-0.25	-0.33	-0.33	-0.39
Total costs	21.94	23.10	25.68	27.70	44.02
<hr/>					
Total costs per egg (pence)	5.01	5.27	6.00	6.98	11.09
Total costs per kg	0.82	0.86	0.99	1.17	1.85
Increase (base 550 cm <sup>2</sup> ), %		5	21	42	125

The conclusion is that after implementation of EU Council Directive 99/74/EC, the housing system with enriched cages produces eggs at the lowest cost. Compared to the situation with conventional cages (before 2012), the production costs of eggs are 5% higher. The production costs in aviaries are higher compared to enriched cages. This means the market price should be higher to keep the income for the egg producer at a constant level. As Table 1.1 shows, other alternative housing systems, such as free range and organic have substantial higher production costs than enriched cages and aviaries. Egg production in these systems need a much higher premium from the market to compensate the egg producer for the additional costs.

## 1.4 Economic impact of legislation

As has been described in Section 1.2, during the last two decades the UK/EU laying hen sector has been subjected to more stringent environmental protection, animal welfare and food safety legislation. This legislation can result in additional production costs for laying hen producers in the UK/EU. For the following aspects, an estimate was made of these additional costs:

### *Environmental protection*

- Manure disposal costs (as result of the Nitrate directive).
- Reduction of ammonia emissions (at manure application, manure storage and in the poultry house).


### *Food safety*

- Salmonella control. Costs of hygiene measures, collection of samples and testing, and vaccination.
- Meat-and-bone meal (MBM). There is no longer a ban on the use of meat-and-bone meal in the EU. However, there are still many restrictions resulting in higher costs compared to some countries outside the EU.
- Genetically Modified Organisms (GMO). The strict rules in the EU on the use of GMO crops result in higher feed costs.

### *Animal Welfare*

- Beak trimming. Routine beak trimming of layers in the UK is only permitted at day-old using infra-red beak treatment technology. Compared to the situation without any legislation, in which beak trimming would take place at six weeks, there will be additional feed costs (higher feed intake during rearing) and higher mortality rates.
- Density. Additional housing costs for increasing the space allowance per hen from 450 cm<sup>2</sup> to 550 cm<sup>2</sup>.
- Enriched cages. Costs of conversion from conventional to enriched cages with an increase in space allowance towards 750 cm<sup>2</sup>.

In this study the costs were estimated for the year 2021, based on the average situation in the UK and other illustrated EU countries. Manure disposal costs differ between countries, with high costs in certain high poultry concentration regions and much lower costs in other regions with a small number of poultry farms. Figure 1.1 provides all the cost components of the specific legislation. The additional costs directly related to UK/EU legislation are 14% of the total production costs of eggs for the situation in 2021.



**Figure 1.1** Basic production costs (86%) and costs directly related to EU legislation (14%) in 2021

Animal welfare legislation gives the largest increase in production costs. This is mainly caused by an increase in the space allowance from 450 cm<sup>2</sup> to 550 cm<sup>2</sup> in 2003, followed by the requirement to use enriched cages

---

(minimum 750 cm<sup>2</sup>). Other important legislation causing an increase in costs are environmental protection (reduction of ammonia emission) and Salmonella control.

Future national legislation may further increase production costs of eggs.

## 1.5 Situation in some third countries

Several reports give an overview of legislation in selected third countries. Van Wagenberg et al. (2012) extensively studied the standards on food safety, environment and animal welfare in several non-EU countries. A study at Wageningen UR (Bracke, 2009) focused on animal welfare regulations and husbandry standards in the poultry sector with special attention for the poultry sector in Brazil and the USA. Also, Van Horne and Bondt (2017) mapped the situation in the USA, India, Ukraine and Argentina in the egg layer sector. Lichter and Kleibrink (2016) did an extensive analysis on standards for poultry production in 16 important poultry producing countries worldwide. ADAS (2016) made a comparison of regulatory requirements and key practices in the poultry meat supply chain in the EU and USA. This report gives an overview covering the key areas of farm production systems and feed supply.

In general, non-EU countries do not have, or have limited, legislation on environmental protection, food safety, and animal welfare. In some countries, for example the USA, the standards for food safety and animal health are considered by some to be equivalent to those in the UK/EU. Nevertheless, standards between the UK/EU and third countries do differ with regard to the type of veterinary drugs allowed and GMOs that are approved. Specifically for animal welfare, research shows that the UK/EU standards are the highest in the world with detailed and strict regulations to protect the welfare of poultry (Lichter and Kleibrink, 2016).

In most third countries, the standards for the environment and animal welfare are lacking or the standards are lower than they are in the UK/EU. These topics are not incorporated or only marginally incorporated into trade agreements. Internationally accepted conventions or standards exist for food safety (Codex Alimentarius), animal health and animal welfare (World Organisation for Animal Health - WOAAH), but do not exist for the environment. WOAAH codes are a recommendation to its members and the WOAAH has no power to force their members to follow the recommendations or standards laid down in the codes. Food safety and animal health are important aspects in negotiating and establishing trade agreements, but the environment and animal welfare are not, or are not high on the agenda (van Wagenberg et al., 2012).

Important exporters of eggs and egg products to the EU are USA, India, Argentina and Ukraine. These countries have less stringent food safety regulations than the UK/EU, such as regulations on the use of meat-and-bone meal in poultry feed and less or no restrictions on the use of GMO crops as ingredients in poultry feed. Furthermore, these countries have no or limited environmental protection legislation, partly because it is not needed. Because animal welfare legislation is the main cause for the additional costs related to legislation, we give a more detailed overview of the animal welfare legislation and standards in these countries. This is complemented with a summary of the main characteristics of the egg sector and the export position in these countries.

### *USA*

The USA is, with 323 million layers in 2021, the second largest egg producer in the world and also a large exporter of eggs and egg products. Egg production in the USA is mainly concentrated in the Mid-West. In the commercial egg sector numerous independent producers are marketing on a local basis, applying price competition as a major component of their marketing strategy. All producers in the top 20 have more than 5 million layers. These top 20 producers represent more than 80% of the sector. These egg producers have in total 230 million layers, representing 80% of the sector. These companies have the 'economies of scale' and have a high efficiency in production, marketing and distribution.

The issue of animal welfare has become a more significant consumer concern in the USA in recent years. Proposed federal legislation (2011 proposal) that would have set national standards for egg production in the USA were not accepted by the government, however, some states, especially on the West and East coast

---

have implemented a cage ban. Later the producers' organisation United Egg Producers established voluntary guidelines to improve the welfare of laying hens. The guidelines include provisions for more space for layers in cages, conditions for moulting and standards for beak trimming. Within the UEP programme the birds have more space in the cage. The space allowance per bird is 432 cm<sup>2</sup> for white layers. White layers constitute 93% of the total layer population. Participating producers will be audited annually through an independent certification programme.

Starting in 2015 many restaurant chains, food manufacturers, and retailers announced they would purchase 100% cage-free by 2025/2026. A total of 224 million cage-free layers will be needed by 2026 to supply the companies that have pledged to go cage-free. At this point the market for alternative (non-cage) eggs in the USA is around 30% (IEC, 2022). However, recently some supermarkets chains, e.g. Walmart, have postponed the promise on going cage-free. This change in market demand is expected to increase the share of layers kept in non-cage systems to around 60 to 70% in 2026.

### *Ukraine*

After Ukraine became independent in 1991 the principles of the free market economy were introduced. Since the egg sector was privatised in 1998, it has shown remarkable progress. Although all major laying breeds can be found in the country, bird performance often lags behind their capabilities. However, in recent years performance has improved as a result of better management, improved feed quality and a modern health service. Two large companies each with several million layers dominate the egg market in Ukraine: Ovostar and Avangard. Ukrainian exports grew rapidly in recent years and Ukraine is now the largest supplier of eggs and egg products to the EU.

In Ukraine there is no governmental legislation for a minimum space allowance for laying hens. It is estimated that on the farms the hens have between 400 and 450 cm<sup>2</sup> per bird. The Ministry of Agriculture has the objective to adapt national legislation on animal welfare to the standards of the UK/EU. However, so far, the government did set not any standards on the welfare of laying hens.

### *Argentina*

The egg sector in Argentina is growing steadily in terms of production, value and exports. In 2021 Argentina had 48 million layers. These layers are kept on 950 farms with 92% of the hens in traditional cages (IEC, 2022). Beside the production of shell eggs, Argentina also has a growing egg processing sector. The egg sector has contributed to reversing the country's situation from being an importer of egg products to being an important exporter.

No legislation regulating specific animal welfare practices for laying hens exists in Argentina. In 2009 a survey was conducted and interviews with producers and businessmen in the egg sector were held. The survey was undertaken by the University of Buenos Aires and included 30 operations (UBA, 2009). Factors directly related to layer welfare include space allowances and methods of beak trimming. All farms in the survey kept layers in cages. The type of cage differed between farms. The average space allowance was 372 cm<sup>2</sup> per hen compared with 750 cm<sup>2</sup> in the UK. However, there was a wide range in space allowance between companies. All surveyed farms used pullets that had their beaks trimmed. The average age at which this was performed was 12 days with a range of 6 to 28 days. The beak trimming also differed in how much of the beak was trimmed, with the majority of farms trimming between one quarter and one third of the beak. A report from Wageningen UR (van Horne et al., 2010) gives an extensive overview of the animal welfare situation in the layer, broiler and pig sector in Argentina.

### *India*

India is the number four producer of eggs in the world. In 2021 India had 260 million laying hens (IEC, 2022). India is a large egg producer and exports shell eggs and dried egg products. A number of egg powder plants have been developed for export. There are 20,000 farms around the country. The farm size varies from 5,000 birds per farm to a maximum of 500,000 birds. Most of the farms keep laying hens until 76 weeks of age and forced moulting is not practiced in India. Although western breeds are used in India, the local breed BV-300 has a high market share. This breed is completely acclimatised to the Indian agroclimatic and feed conditions, resulting in high egg production. The growing population in India will increase the local

---

market for eggs, making export efforts unnecessary for Indian producers. However, some of the large companies are exporting egg powder to the EU and Japan.

Most commercial layers kept on modern farms have open-sided houses where birds are housed in 3 to 4 rows and three-tier conventional cages. The standard cage size for 3 birds is 37.5 cm by 30 cm. The space allowance is 375 cm<sup>2</sup> per bird. This is much lower than the current UK/EU standard of 750 cm<sup>2</sup> per bird. For a long time animal welfare was not an issue for the government in India because in real life improving animal welfare is limited by the poverty of a great part of the population and the life philosophy within the Hindu culture (Bracke, 2009). At the moment the Indian government is discussing a minimum space allowance of 550 cm<sup>2</sup> per hen in cage housing, however, no date has been agreed when this would come into force.

---


## 2 Production costs of eggs in the UK and selected EU countries

### 2.1 Production costs of *enriched cage* eggs

The production costs of shell eggs produced by hens housed in enriched cages has been researched for the following countries: the United Kingdom (UK), the Netherlands (NL), Germany (DE), France (FR), Spain (ES), Italy (IT), Denmark (DK) and Poland (PL). All of these countries, apart from Denmark, are important egg-producing countries within the EU. The results presented in this chapter relate to the year 2021. All costs in this report are given in pound sterling.

#### 2.1.1 Production costs at primary farm

Figure 2.1 and Table 2.2 provide an insight into the build-up of primary production costs. Table 2.1 provides the data used in the calculations. The production costs can be divided into six components: hen (costs of young hen at 20 weeks, less the revenue from the spent hen), feed (feed costs during the laying period), other (all other variable costs e.g. electricity and animal health), labour (costs of the labour of the farmer or a farm worker), housing (depreciation, interest and maintenance cost on building and equipment) and general (book-keeping, clothing, insurance and, if relevant, manure disposal costs). The costs of primary production (in pence per kilogram of eggs) are the highest in the UK: 90.4 pence per kg of eggs. The costs in Germany, Denmark, Spain and Italy are 86 to 87 pence per kg. In Poland, the Netherlands and France the costs of production are at the lowest level of the selected EU countries: 83 to 84 pence per kg. The differences in costs for the primary production are mainly caused by differences in feed costs, the price of young hens (pullets), housing costs and manure disposal costs. Of all countries the feed prices in the UK, Spain and Italy are the highest and the prices in France and the Netherlands are the lowest. Young hens (pullets) are relatively cheap in Denmark. Poland has the advantage of low labour costs and Spain and Poland have the highest revenues for manure. While farmers in Germany and Denmark have good technical results, their production costs in an EU context are on an average level. This is partly caused by higher housing costs. The Netherlands is notable for its high manure disposal costs. All countries have a revenue for spent hens, although it is relatively low in the UK and Denmark.



**Figure 2.1** Costs of primary production in enriched cages in the UK and seven EU countries (pence per kilogram of eggs) in 2021

**Table 2.1** Data on egg production in the UK and seven EU countries in 2021 (enriched cages)


Feed price (pound sterling/100 kg)	26.8	26.3	25.5	25.5	26.8	26.8	25.9	26.3
Price hen at 20 weeks (pound sterling/hen)	4.45	4.17	4.09	4.10	4.29	4.20	3.92	4.26
Laying period (days)	420	480	440	490	450	440	460	440
Eggs per hen	375	431	395	438	395	385	420	390
Egg weight (g)	63.0	61.0	62.0	61.0	62.5	63.0	62.0	62.0
Feed conversion	2.02	1.97	2.02	1.96	2.01	2.00	1.96	2.00

**Table 2.2** Costs of primary production (in pence per kilogram of enriched cage eggs) in the UK and selected EU countries in 2021

	UK	DE	FR	NL	ES	IT	DK	PL
Total costs inclusive labour	90.4	86.8	83.9	83.3	86.0	86.5	86.1	83.2
Total costs exclusive labour	86.7	82.2	79.3	78.6	82.9	83.6	81.2	81.3
Hen cost at 20 weeks	18.8	15.9	16.7	15.4	17.4	17.3	15.0	17.6
Feed	54.0	51.9	51.4	49.9	53.8	53.5	50.7	52.6
Other	5.3	4.6	3.8	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.8	4.1
Labour	3.7	4.7	4.5	4.7	3.2	2.9	4.8	1.8
Housing	7.5	9.3	7.5	7.6	7.4	7.3	9.1	6.9
General	1.4	1.4	1.1	1.4	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.0
Manure disposal	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.8	-0.2	0.6	0.3	-0.2
Revenue spent hen	-0.4	-1.0	-1.2	-0.9	-0.9	-0.9	-0.1	-0.6

## 2.1.2 Production costs of egg powder

The costs of producing egg powder are made up of the costs of eggs and the costs of processing. The costs are calculated based on processing in a large commercial egg powder plant. The basic assumption is that the dry matter content of eggs is 20.5%. The main components in the processing are building and equipment (41%), labour (22%) and energy (23%). The other costs (14%) are for packaging and costs of sales. These costs vary from EU country to country. However, because all processing plants in the EU use advanced modern equipment, it is assumed that the differences in processing between countries are mainly a result of differences in labour costs. Also, differences in interest rates between countries are taken into account and have an impact on the annual costs of building and equipment. Figure 2.2 gives the final results of costs at farm level and the costs of processing in pence per kg of egg powder. The results show that the processing costs amount to approximately 20% of the total cost to produce egg powder. The difference between the cost levels of the most expensive country (UK) and the cheapest country (Poland) is 4% above and 5% below the average of all countries.



**Figure 2.2** Costs of production of whole egg powder from enriched cages in the UK and seven EU countries (pence per kilogram of egg powder) in 2021


## 2.2 Production costs of *barn* eggs

The production costs of shell eggs produced by hens housed in barns were estimated for the UK, the Netherlands (NL), Germany (DE), France (FR), Spain (ES), Italy (IT), Denmark (DK) and Poland (PL). Calculations are based on keeping hens in an aviary system with a density of a maximum of 18 hens per square metre poultry house.

### 2.2.1 Production costs at primary farm

Figure 2.3 and Table 2.3 provide an insight into the build-up of primary production costs. The production costs can be divided into six components: hen (costs of young hen at 20 weeks, less the revenue from the

spent hen), feed (feed costs during the laying period), other (all other variable costs e.g. electricity and animal health), labour (costs of the labour of the farmer or a farm worker), housing (depreciation, interest and maintenance cost on building and equipment) and general (book-keeping, clothing, insurance and, if relevant, manure disposal costs). The costs of primary production (in pence per kilogram of eggs) are the highest in the UK. The average production costs in the UK are 108.7 pence per kg of eggs. This is 20% higher compared to the average of 90.4 pence per kg for the enriched cage eggs in the UK. The costs to produce barn eggs in Germany, France, Spain, Italy and Denmark are 104 to 107 pence per kg of eggs. In the Netherlands and Poland the costs of barn egg production are at the lowest level of the selected EU countries: 101 to 103 pence per kg. The differences in costs for the primary production are mainly caused by differences in labour costs, feed costs and the price of young hens (pullets).




**Figure 2.3** Costs of primary production (in pence per kg) of barn eggs in the UK and seven EU countries in 2021

**Table 2.3** Costs of primary production (in pence per kg) of barn eggs in the UK and seven EU countries in 2021

	UK	DE	FR	NL	ES	IT	DK	PL
Total costs inclusive labour	108.7	104.3	106.6	100.6	103.6	104.9	106.1	102.6
Total costs exclusive labour	102.1	96.2	96.8	92.6	98.7	100.0	97.0	100.1
Hen cost at 20 weeks	23.2	20.2	22.0	19.7	21.8	22.1	22.1	22.6
Feed	59.7	57.9	57.3	54.7	60.2	60.2	55.7	60.5
Other	6.3	6.0	6.4	5.8	6.0	6.2	6.2	6.1
Labour	6.6	8.1	9.8	8.0	4.9	4.9	9.1	2.5
Housing	11.0	10.7	10.4	10.3	9.8	9.9	10.3	10.0
General	2.4	2.4	1.9	2.3	1.9	1.9	2.3	1.7
Manure disposal	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.9	-0.3	0.7	0.3	-0.3
Revenue spent hen	-0.4	-1.1	-1.2	-1.1	-0.9	-0.9	-0.1	-0.6

## 2.2.2 Production costs of egg powder

The costs of producing egg powder are made up of the costs of eggs and the costs of processing. The costs are calculated based on processing in a large commercial egg powder plant. The basic assumptions are similar to those of processing enriched cage eggs (see Section 2.1.2). Figure 2.4 gives the final results of farm level costs and processing costs in pence per kg of egg powder. The average production costs of egg powder, based on barn eggs in the UK is 631 pence per kg of egg powder. The processing costs amount to approximately 16% of the total costs to produce egg powder. The difference between the cost levels of the most expensive country (Denmark) and the cheapest country (Poland) is 3% above and 4% below the average of all countries. The average production costs in the UK of whole egg powder from barn eggs are 16% higher than the average for enriched cage eggs (542 pence per kg, Section 2.1.2).



**Figure 2.4** Costs of production of whole egg powder from barn eggs in the UK and seven EU countries (pence per kilogram of egg powder) in 2021


## 2.3 Production costs of free range eggs

The production costs of shell eggs produced by hens housed in free range systems were estimated for the UK, the Netherlands (NL), Germany (DE), France (FR), Spain (ES), Italy (IT), Denmark (DK) and Poland (PL). Calculations are based on keeping hens in an aviary system with a density of a maximum of 18 hens per square metre poultry house with access to an outdoor range.

### 2.3.1 Production costs at primary farm

Figure 2.5 and Table 2.4 provide an insight into the build-up of primary production costs. The production costs can be divided into six components: hen (costs of young hen at 20 weeks, less the revenue from the spent hen), feed (feed costs during the laying period), other (all other variable costs e.g. electricity and animal health), labour (costs of the labour of the farmer or a farm worker), housing (depreciation, interest and maintenance cost on building and equipment) and general (book-keeping, clothing, insurance and, if

relevant, manure disposal costs). The costs of primary production (in pence per kilogram of eggs) are the highest in the United Kingdom: 120.2 pence per kg of eggs. This is 33% higher compared to the average of 90.4 pence per kg for the enriched cage eggs in the UK. The costs of free range eggs in Germany, France, the Netherlands, Italy and Denmark are 114 to 118 pence per kg of eggs. In Spain and Poland the costs of production of free range eggs are at the lowest level of the selected EU countries: 110 to 112 pence per kg. The differences in costs for the primary production are mainly caused by differences in feed costs, the price of young hens (pullets) and labour costs.




**Figure 2.5** Costs of primary production in free range systems in the UK and seven EU countries (pence per kilogram of eggs) in 2021

**Table 2.4** Costs of primary production (in pence per kilogram) of free range eggs in seven EU countries in 2021

	UK	DE	FR	NL	ES	IT	DK	PL
Total costs inclusive labour	120.2	117.1	116.7	116.0	112.3	114.0	118.3	110.1
Total costs exclusive labour	107.2	104.1	102.0	102.9	104.4	106.2	105.4	103.5
Hen cost at 20 weeks	22.9	21.7	23.6	21.6	23.3	23.1	23.1	23.4
Feed	62.3	60.2	58.8	58.3	62.0	62.3	59.2	61.5
Other	6.1	6.9	6.9	6.8	6.3	6.5	6.9	6.2
Labour	13.0	13.1	14.7	13.1	7.8	7.8	12.9	6.6
Housing	12.5	12.4	11.1	12.7	11.0	11.5	12.1	10.6
General	3.8	3.8	3.1	3.8	3.1	3.1	3.8	2.7
Manure disposal	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.9	-0.3	0.6	0.3	-0.3
Revenue spent hen	-0.4	-1.2	-1.3	-1.2	-1.0	-0.9	-0.1	-0.6

### 2.3.2 Production costs egg powder

The costs of producing egg powder are made up of the costs of eggs and the costs of processing. The costs are calculated based on processing in a large commercial egg powder plant. The basic assumptions are similar to those of processing enriched cage eggs (see Section 2.1.2). Figure 2.6 gives the final results of farm level costs and processing costs in pence per kg of egg powder. The average production costs of egg powder, based on free range eggs in the UK is 687 pence per kg of eggs. The processing costs amount to approximately 15% of the total cost to produce egg powder. The difference between the cost levels of the most expensive country (UK) and the cheapest country (Poland) is 3% above and 6% below the EU average. The average production costs in the UK of whole egg powder from free range eggs are 27% higher than the average for enriched cage eggs (542 pence per kg, Section 2.1.2).



**Figure 2.6** Costs of production of whole egg powder from free range in the UK and seven EU countries (pence per kilogram of egg powder) in 2021


# 3 Production costs of eggs in selected non-EU countries

## 3.1 Production costs of cage eggs

The production cost of shell eggs for consumption has been researched for the following non-EU countries, which were the main exporters of eggs and egg products to the EU in 2021 Ukraine (UKR), the United States of America (USA) and Argentina (ARG). India (IND) has also been a significant exporter to the EU. The production costs of the third countries are presented in pence.

### 3.1.1 Production costs at primary farm

Figure 3.1 and Table 3.2 compare the average primary production costs in the four third countries with those in the UK. Table 3.1 gives input data used in the calculations. The hen costs are defined as the hen cost at 20 weeks, less the revenue of the spent hen. General costs are the actual general costs plus the manure disposal costs, or less the revenue of manure. The costs of primary production in all four third countries are lower than in the UK. In USA and Ukraine the costs are 26 and 24% lower than the UK level of 90.4 pence per kg of eggs, in Argentina and India 19 and 20% lower. The feed price determines the total production costs to a significant extent. The feed price is considerably lower in Ukraine and USA than in the UK, mainly because of the domestic availability of sizeable quantities of feed ingredients such as maize and soy beans. British egg producers largely depend on South American imports for some of their protein feed ingredients. The costs of storage, transport and merchant's profit increase the price of feed ingredients in the UK. The price of a young hen in the UK is also higher because of the high feed price. In addition to these differences, some third countries have the lower housing and labour costs. Wages are much lower in Ukraine and especially in India. Furthermore, in all mentioned third countries, producers have lower costs because legislation on environment, food safety and animal welfare is either less stringent or non-existent compared with the UK (see Chapter 1).



**Figure 3.1** Costs of primary production in enriched cages in the UK and conventional cages in selected non-EU countries (pence per kilogram of eggs) in 2021

**Table 3.1** Data on egg production in the UK and selected non-EU countries in 2021


	UK	USA	UKR	ARG	IND
Feed price (pound sterling/100 kg)	26.8	21.4	22.0	23.7	24.6
Price hen at 20 weeks (pound sterling/hen)	4.4	3.34	3.31	3.30	3.00
Laying period (days)	420	490	440	450	440
Eggs per hen	375	430	375	385	375
Egg weight (g)	63.0	60.0	63.0	63.0	58.0
Feed conversion	2.02	1.96	2.03	2.07	2.24

**Table 3.2** Costs of primary production (in pence per kilogram of eggs) in the UK and selected non-EU countries in 2021

	UK	USA	UKR	ARG	IND
Total costs inclusive labour	90.4	67.0	68.7	73.0	72.3
Total costs exclusive labour	86.7	65.2	65.5	69.9	70.6
Hen cost at 20 weeks	18.8	13.0	14.0	13.6	13.8
Feed	54.0	41.9	44.7	49.1	55.1
Other	5.3	2.5	3.4	3.0	4.1
Labour	3.7	1.8	3.1	3.1	1.7
Housing	7.5	6.8	6.3	5.1	1.3
General	1.4	1.1	0.7	0.7	0.8
Manure disposal	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Revenue spent hen	-0.4	0.0	-3.6	-1.7	-4.5

### 3.1.2 Production costs of egg powder

The costs of producing egg powder consists of the costs of eggs and processing costs. The costs are calculated based on processing in a large commercial egg powder plant. The calculations are similar to the method described in Section 2.1.2. Figure 3.2 shows that the production costs of whole egg powder in the USA, Ukraine, Argentina and India are respectively 24%, 21%, 17% and 20% lower than in the UK. Differences are mainly due to the differences in primary egg production costs.

**Figure 3.2** Costs of production of whole egg powder in the UK and four non-EU countries (pence per kilogram of egg powder) in 2021

---

## 4 Results of different scenarios

In this chapter four scenarios have been defined (Section 4.1), which have been examined for shell eggs (Section 4.2) and for whole egg powder (Section 4.3).

### 4.1 Description of the scenarios

To show the impact of a possible change in import levies and a change in the exchange rate on the competitiveness of UK egg producers and egg processors, four scenarios have been developed:


1. 50% reduction of the UK import levies on egg and egg products, as a possible result of a new bilateral trade agreement (or multilateral (WTO) agreement).
2. 10% lower exchange rates of the US dollar, Argentine peso, Ukrainian hryvnia and Indian rupee compared to the pound sterling.
3. Combination of 50% lower import levies and a 10% lower exchange rate of the third countries' currencies.
4. Combination of no import levies and a 10% lower exchange rate of the third countries' currencies. This is the 'worst-case' scenario.

### 4.2 Shell eggs

#### 4.2.1 Basic situation


To estimate the offer price of shell eggs in the UK, we add the transportation costs from the major production area of a third country to an important market region in the UK, in this case Birmingham. Transportation costs have been estimated based on a full truck load of shell eggs. The offer price in Birmingham is the sum of production costs (farm level and processing), transportation costs and import levies.

Figure 4.1 shows the estimated offer price in Birmingham of enriched cage shell eggs produced in the UK and of conventional cage system shell eggs from Ukraine, the USA, Argentina and India. The horizontal line indicates the UK level of total costs, including the 2 pence/kg costs of transport to Birmingham. The Ukraine and the USA could be a threat for British egg producers, but the current 26 pence/kg levy on imports means that it is not cost effective to export shell eggs to the UK market. Figure 4.1 also shows that imports from Argentina and India will not be competitive in a situation without import levies, because of the high transport costs. In addition, the UK/EU egg marketing standards, with a best-before data of 28 days from lay, plus Salmonella control requirements, effectively preclude imports of shell eggs, apart from Ukraine.



**Figure 4.1** Offer price of shell eggs (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (enriched cages; horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram of egg (basic situation)


Figure 4.2 shows that cage system shell eggs from Ukrainian producers could be competitive with barn system shell eggs produced in the UK, even in a situation with import levies. However, this is not really the case, because barn eggs are sold on another market than cage eggs. Therefore, this is not included in the scenarios.



**Figure 4.2** Offer price of shell eggs in Birmingham from the UK (barn and free range eggs) and non-EU countries (cage eggs) in pence per kilogram of egg (basic situation)

#### 4.2.2 Scenario 1 - Lower import levies


In the first scenario the impact of 50% lower levies on imports into the UK has been examined. As Figure 4.3 illustrates, none of the non-EU countries would be competitive on the UK market in a situation with an import levy of 13 pence per kg.



**Figure 4.3** Offer price of shell eggs (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram of egg (scenario 1: 50% lower import levies)

### 4.2.3 Scenario 2 - Lower exchange rates


This second scenario evaluates the consequences of 10% lower exchange rates of the currencies of the selected non-EU countries. Lower exchange rates have less impact than the lower import levies of scenario 1. Figure 4.4 shows that in the case of 10% lower exchange rates none of the non-EU countries would be real competition on the UK market.



**Figure 4.4** Offer price of shell eggs (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram of egg (scenario 2: 10% lower exchange rates)

#### 4.2.4 Scenario 3 - Combination of lower import levies and lower exchange rates


The third scenario is a combination of the previous scenarios: 50% lower import levies and also 10% lower exchange rates of all non-EU currencies (Figure 4.5). In this scenario, Ukraine obtains a competitive position on the UK market for shell eggs. The USA, Argentina and India still would not be competitive.



**Figure 4.5** Offer price of shell eggs (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram egg (scenario 3: 50% lower import levies and 10% lower exchange rate)

#### 4.2.5 Scenario 4 - Combination of zero import levies and lower exchange rates

The fourth scenario is a combination of zero import levies and 10% lower exchange rates of all non-EU currencies (Figure 4.6). In this scenario three of the four selected non-EU countries have a lower offer price than the UK egg producers.




**Figure 4.6** Offer price of shell eggs (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram egg (scenario 4: zero import levies and 10% lower exchange rates)

## 4.3 Whole egg powder

Egg powder is more suitable for long-distance transport than shell eggs because there is no decrease in product quality after months of storage. Another advantage of egg powder is the relatively low transport costs because the product is dried.


### 4.3.1 Basic situation

The assumed market location is Birmingham in the UK, for which an offer price has been calculated. The offer price is the total of production costs, processing costs, transport costs and import levies. Figure 4.7 shows that the levies on imports provide enough protection for whole egg powder made from cage system eggs produced in the non-EU countries with egg powder made from enriched cage system eggs produced in the UK. However, egg powder from Ukraine and the USA could almost compete, despite the full import levies.



**Figure 4.7** Offer price of whole egg powder (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (enriched cage; horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram (basic situation)


Figure 4.8 shows that egg powder made from barn and free range system eggs in the UK cannot compete with egg powder made from conventional cage system eggs produced in these non-EU countries, even in a situation with full import levies. However, in practice egg powder made from barn or free range eggs is sold to a specific market. Therefore, this is not included in the scenarios.



**Figure 4.8** Offer price of whole egg powder in Birmingham from the UK (barn and free range eggs) and non-EU countries (conventional cage eggs) in pence per kilogram (basic situation)

### 4.3.2 Scenario 1 - Lower EU import levies


Figure 4.9 shows that with 50% lower import levies all four non-EU countries can be relatively cheap suppliers of egg powder to Birmingham. Especially the total costs of production, transport and import levies of the Ukraine and USA are substantially below the UK level.



**Figure 4.9** Offer price of whole egg powder (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (enriched cage; horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram (scenario 1: 50% lower import levies)

### 4.3.3 Scenario 2 - Lower exchange rates


This second scenario evaluates the consequences of 10% lower exchange rates of all non-EU currencies (Figure 4.10). In this scenario Ukraine, the USA and India can be relatively cheap suppliers of whole egg powder in Birmingham. However, this scenario has less impact than the previous scenario with the lower import levies.



**Figure 4.10** Offer price of whole egg powder (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (enriched cage; horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram (scenario 2: 10% lower exchange rate).

#### 4.3.4 Scenario 3 - Combination of lower import levies and lower exchange rates


This scenario is a combination of the previous two scenarios: 50% lower import levies (scenario 1) and also 10% lower exchange rates of all non-EU currencies (scenario 2). Figure 4.11 shows that all four non-EU countries would be very cheap suppliers of whole egg powder to the UK market. Offer prices in Birmingham of the non-EU countries are clearly below the UK level.



**Figure 4.11** Offer price of whole egg powder (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (enriched cage; horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram (scenario 3: 50% lower import levies and 10% lower exchange rate)

### 4.3.5 Scenario 4 - Combination of zero import levies and lower exchange rates

This 'worst-case' scenario is a combination of zero import levies and 10% lower exchange rates of the non-EU currencies. Figure 4.12 shows that the non-EU countries would be very cheap suppliers of whole egg powder to the UK market. Offer prices in Birmingham could be 21% (Argentina) to 28% (USA) below the UK level.



**Figure 4.12** Offer price of whole egg powder (cage eggs) in Birmingham from the UK (enriched cage; horizontal line) and non-EU countries in pence per kilogram (scenario 4: zero import levies)

---

## 5 Conclusions

### *Production costs in 2021 within the UK and EU countries*

The production costs of shell eggs produced in enriched cages were calculated for the United Kingdom and seven EU countries: Germany, France, the Netherlands, Spain, Italy, Denmark and Poland. Between these egg-producing countries, the production costs of shell eggs in 2021 ranged from 83 pence per kg of eggs in Poland and the Netherlands to 87 pence per kg of eggs in Germany and Italy. In the UK, production costs in 2021 are 90 pence per kg of eggs. The total production costs for whole egg powder also differ within the seven EU countries, from 493 pence per kg of egg powder in Poland to 531 pence per kg in Germany. In the UK average production costs are 542 pence per kg of egg powder.

### *Production costs in 2021 in non-EU countries*

Compared to the average level within the UK, the costs of production for shell eggs in 2021 were lower in Ukraine (-24%), USA (-26%), Argentina (-19%) and India (-20%). As a result of the costs of transportation, import levies and the effects on product quality and safety (especially from Argentina and India), there are very few imports of shell eggs from those countries to the UK. In addition, in the UK/EU egg marketing standards, with a best-before date of 28 days from lay, plus Salmonella control requirements, effectively preclude imports of shell eggs, apart from Ukraine. For whole egg powder the non-EU countries are more competitive. Compared to the UK level (enriched cages), the production costs of whole egg powder from conventional cages in 2021 were lower in USA (-24%), Ukraine (-21%), Argentina (-17%) and India (-20%). Because the costs of transportation of powder are low (12 to 24 pence per kg), the offer price of whole egg powder from third countries is relatively low. However, current import levies still protect the UK market from large quantities of imports from these countries.

### *UK and retained EU legislation*

In the UK and the EU, egg producers have to comply with European legislation. This legislation deals with environmental protection, animal welfare and food safety, amongst others. The additional costs of EU legislation were estimated to be 14% of the total production costs of eggs at farm level. In these calculations the following legislation was taken into account:

- *Environmental protection*  
Nitrates directive to protect land and water and the reduction of ammonia emissions to protect air.
- *Food safety*  
Reduction of Salmonella prevalence, regulations on the use of meat-and-bone meal in poultry feed and regulations on GMO feed ingredients.
- *Animal welfare*  
Minimum standards on space allowance and legislation on beak trimming.

An important EU law, which is retained in the UK, causing an increase in production costs is Council Directive 1999/74/EC 'welfare of laying hens'. This legislation was implemented in 2012 on UK/EU egg laying farms. There was a 5% increase in the costs of production as the sector moved from conventional cages to enriched cages. The British egg industry (BEIC) estimates the capital costs to be £400 million across the sector.

This EU legislation, mainly related to environment, animal welfare and food safety, is less stringent or non-existent in non-EU countries.

### *Welfare legislation in non-EU countries*

In the countries outside the EU illustrated in this report only the USA has a voluntary programme to increase the space allowance per hen towards 432 cm<sup>2</sup>. However, the most common system of egg production in the USA is still the conventional cage system, which was banned in the EU from 1 January 2012. The USA has no federal legislation in place for laying hen welfare. In Argentina, India and Ukraine there is no legislation on laying hen welfare and hens are kept in conventional cages with a space allowance of 400 to 450 cm<sup>2</sup> per hen. Between countries, regions and farms, the stocking density can change due to expected market prices

---

(high density when high egg prices are expected), climate (lower density in hot areas) and housing systems (open or climate-controlled houses). American literature shows that purely from an economic point of view, 350 to 400 cm<sup>2</sup> per hen gives the highest income for the egg producer (Bell, 2000).

#### *Scenarios on import levies and exchange rates*

To show the impact of a possible change in import levies and a change in exchange rate on the competitiveness of the UK egg sector, four scenarios were developed. In the first scenario 50% lower import levies on shell eggs and whole egg powder was taken as an example to illustrate the impact of any multi- or bilateral agreement with lower import levies. For shell eggs, competition from the selected third countries is not expected to increase a lot, because of the specific market for barn and free range eggs and the UK requirements on egg marketing standards, with a best-before data of 28 days from lay, plus Salmonella control requirements.

However, for egg powder, the results show that already in this first scenario all non-EU countries can be relatively cheap suppliers of egg powder to Birmingham. Especially the offer prices of the Ukraine and the USA are substantially below the UK level.

In the second scenario with a 10% lower exchange rate, the price of whole egg powder from three of the four non-EU countries would be lower than the UK level. In the third scenario with a combination of 50% lower import levies and a 10% lower exchange rate, all four selected non-EU countries would be cheap suppliers of whole egg powder to the UK market. Offer prices in Birmingham could be 10% (Argentina) to 17% (USA) below the UK level. This is even more the case in scenario 4, in which the import levies are totally removed and there is a 10% lower exchange rate of all non-EU countries.

---

# Sources and literature

## Literature

- Aarnink, A.J.A. and H.H. Ellen, 2008. *Processes and factors affecting dust emissions from livestock production*. In: *Dust Conf 2007. How to improve air quality*. International conference, 23-24.4, 2008, Maastricht, The Netherlands.
- ADAS, 2016. *Comparison of the Regulatory Framework and key Practices in the Poultry Meat Supply Chain in the EU and USA*. Study by ADAS UK Ltd in conjunction with the University of Arkansas. UK, 2016.
- Backus, G.B.C., P. Berkhout, D. Eaton, L. Franke, A.J. de Kleijn, B. Lotz, E.M. van Mil, P. Roza and W. Uffelman, 2008. *EU policy on GMOs: a quick scan of the economic consequences*. Report 2008-070. The Hague: LEI.
- Bell, D.B. December 31, 2000. *Economic implications of reducing cage density in the U.S.* Cooperative Extension of the University of California. An economic update, number 234.
- Bracke, M. et al. September 2009. *Animal Welfare in a Global Perspective*. Report 240. Lelystad: Wageningen UR Livestock Research. The Netherlands.
- Chotteau, Ph., N. Beaumont, C. Deblitz, R. Hoste, P. Magdelaine, A. Mottet, K. De Roest, C. Roguet, P. Sarzeaud, M. Topliff and P. Van Horne, 2009. *The impact of increased operating costs on meat livestock in the EU*. Study for the European Parliament. Paris, Institut de l'Élevage. [www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2009/419109/IPOL-AGRI\\_ET\(2009\)419109\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2009/419109/IPOL-AGRI_ET(2009)419109_EN.pdf).
- Horne, P.L.M. van, C.P.A. van Wagenberg, M.A. de Winter, R. Hoste, S.I. Senesi, M.M. Barilatti, M. Daziano, L.D.C. Martino and M.M.T. Becerra, 2010. *The poultry and pig sector in Argentina: husbandry practice and animal welfare*. The Hague: LEI Wageningen UR.
- Horne, P.L.M van and N. Bondt, 2017. *Competitiveness of the EU egg sector, base year 2015; International comparison of production costs*. Report 2017-062. The Hague: Wageningen Economic Research.
- Horne, P.L.M. van and N. Bondt, 2022. *Competitiveness of the EU egg sector, base year 2021; International comparison of production costs of eggs and egg products*. Report 2023-006. Wageningen: Wageningen Economic Research.
- Horne, P.L.M. van, 2019. *Competitiveness of the UK egg sector, base year 2018; International comparison of production costs*. Report 2019-113. Wageningen: Wageningen Economic Research.
- IEC, 2022. *International Egg market. Annual review*. London: International Egg Commission.
- Lichter, J. and Kleibrink, J. 2016. *Comparison of production standards World - Germany* ('Geflügelwirtschaft weltweit - Deutschland im internationalen Vergleich. Eine Analyse der Erzeugungsstandards'). Handelsblatt Research Institute. Düsseldorf, Germany.
- MEG, 2022. *Marktbilanz Eier und Geflügel*. Eugen Ulmer Verlag. Stuttgart, Germany, June 2022.
- UBA, September 2009. *Animal welfare: Argentina as a stakeholder*. Report: Layers. School of Agronomy. University of Buenos Aires.
- Wagenberg, C.P.A. van, F.M. Brouwer, R. Hoste and M.L. Rau, 2012. *Comparative analysis of EU standards in food safety, environment, animal welfare and other non-trade concerns with some selected countries*. European Union. LEI Wageningen UR. [www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2012/474542/IPOL-AGRI\\_ET\(2012\)474542\\_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2012/474542/IPOL-AGRI_ET(2012)474542_EN.pdf).

---

### Data sources

The basic data for calculating the production costs were obtained from several organisations, institutes and companies in the countries. For some countries, data are from the International Egg Commission annual report (IEC, 202). Fed prices of some countries are given by Marktbilanz Eier und Geflügel (MEG, Germany, June 2022). The following are the main sources per country:

Netherlands	Wageningen Economic Research
France	Institut Technique de l' Aviculture (ITAVI)
Spain	Asociacion Espanola de Productores de Huevos (ASEPHRU)
Italy	Vito Mastrangelo, consultant / Cascina Italia – Gruppo Moretti.
UK	British Egg Industry Council (BEIC)
Poland	Wageningen Economic Research, based on several sources
Denmark	Danish Egg Association
Ukraine	Wageningen Economic Research, based on several sources
USA	Egg Industry Center at Iowa State University
Argentina	Wageningen Economic Research, based on several sources School of Agronomy of the University of Buenos Aires (UBA)
India	National Egg Co-ordination Committee (NECC)

# Appendix 1 Main assumptions in different housing systems for layers

**Table A1.1** Main assumptions for labour and investments in housing systems for laying hens

	Conventional cage	Enriched cage	Barn/Aviary	Free range	Organic
Labour:					
Number of hens per worker	75,000	70,000	40,000	25,000	13,000
Buildings:					
Density (hen per m <sup>2</sup> )	35	30	18	18	12
Surface area per house (gross m <sup>2</sup> )	2,336	2,531	2,302	1,429	1,123
Investment:					
Housing (pound sterling per hen housed)	6.32	7.34	11.68	11.59	17.53
Inventory (pound sterling per hen housed)	10.31	14.50	15.10	15.10	24.16

**Table A1.2** Main assumptions for the production results in housing systems for laying hens

	Conventional cage	Enriched cage	Barn/Aviary	Free range	Organic
Laying period (days)	490	490	490	462	462
Eggs per hen housed (number)	438	438	428	397	397
Feed consumption/hen/day (gram)	110	112	118	122	123
Egg production per hen housed (kg)	26.7	26.7	25.9	23.8	23.8

---

Wageningen Economic Research  
P.O. Box 29703  
2502 LS The Hague  
The Netherlands  
T +31 (0)70 335 83 30  
E [communications.ssg@wur.nl](mailto:communications.ssg@wur.nl)  
[wur.eu/economic-research](http://wur.eu/economic-research)

REPORT 2023-119



---

The mission of Wageningen University & Research is "To explore the potential of nature to improve the quality of life". Under the banner Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen University and the specialised research institutes of the Wageningen Research Foundation have joined forces in contributing to finding solutions to important questions in the domain of healthy food and living environment. With its roughly 30 branches, 7,600 employees (6,700 fte) and 13,100 students and over 150,000 participants to WUR's Life Long Learning, Wageningen University & Research is one of the leading organisations in its domain. The unique Wageningen approach lies in its integrated approach to issues and the collaboration between different disciplines.

---



To explore  
the potential  
of nature to  
improve the  
quality of life



---

Wageningen Economic Research  
P.O. Box 29703  
2502 LS Den Haag  
The Netherlands  
T +31 (0) 70 335 83 30  
E [communications.ssg@wur.nl](mailto:communications.ssg@wur.nl)  
[wur.eu/economic-research](http://wur.eu/economic-research)

Report 2023-119  
ISBN 978-94-6447-881-5



---

The mission of Wageningen University & Research is “To explore the potential of nature to improve the quality of life”. Under the banner Wageningen University & Research, Wageningen University and the specialised research institutes of the Wageningen Research Foundation have joined forces in contributing to finding solutions to important questions in the domain of healthy food and living environment. With its roughly 30 branches, 7,600 employees (6,700 fte) and 13,100 students and over 150,000 participants to WUR’s Life Long Learning, Wageningen University & Research is one of the leading organisations in its domain. The unique Wageningen approach lies in its integrated approach to issues and the collaboration between different disciplines.

---