

Case No: 72079
Event No: 662585

Final report

EFTA Surveillance Authority mission to Norway

from 22 to 31 October 2012

regarding application of EEA legislation

related to animal welfare during transport and for laying hens on farms

Please note that comments from the Norwegian competent authorities to factual errors in the draft report have been included in *underlined italic print* in the body of the report. Comments and information on the corrective actions already taken and planned by the Norwegian competent authorities are included in Annex 6 and referred to in footnotes in *underlined italic print*.

Executive Summary

This report describes the outcome of a mission carried out by the EFTA Surveillance Authority in Norway from 22 to 31 October 2012. The objective of the mission was to verify that official controls related to animal welfare during transport and for laying hens on farms were carried out in compliance with the European Economic Area legislation.

Concerning transport, few movements of live domestic animals such as bovine, porcine, ovine and caprine animals takes place from and to Norway and other States of the European Economic Area (EEA). The majority of international trade is related to registered Equidae and pets. The national rules forbid the transport of animals for slaughtering more than eight hours, however, a derogation allowing transport for slaughter of up to eleven hours is applicable in some regions with difficult conditions where slaughtering facilities are not reachable within the eight hours. The mission team was informed that transports of live animals for breeding and/or farming, often exceeding eight hours up to 20 or more hours, take place within Norway. Nevertheless, these long journeys are carried out also by transporters using vehicles not approved for long journeys.

In Norway there is not a systematic national approach ensuring official controls at all stages of transport of animals. Official controls concerning the welfare of animals during transport are almost exclusively carried out at arrival at slaughterhouses facilities therefore missing controls at place of departure, on roads and on roll on-roll off ferries. In 2010 (last data available) 5 760 controls at destination (slaughterhouses) led to 2 922 registered infringements, however, no evidence could be provided that infringements identified at the place of destination led to increased focus on official controls at the place of departure or of the transporters involved.

Several shortcomings have been pointed out by the mission team concerning documentation available both at district and transporters' level, vehicles structure, duties of the competent authority including training of staff and appropriate practical implementation of the EEA requirements concerning animal welfare during transport.

In relation to laying hens there is still one farm with traditional cages operating in Norway, although the use of such cages has been prohibited by EEA legislation since 1 January 2012. Only in one of the district offices visited, the competent authority was able to demonstrate to the mission team the appropriate evaluation of the relevant structures of the different production systems for laying hens to confirm that the EEA requirements were fulfilled.

Data required for registration (maximum capacity of the establishment) and distinguishing number according to production type are not fulfilled. Availability of appropriate perches was also pointed out by the mission team. Both problems with registration data and perches were reported in the previous mission on animal welfare to Norway carried out in 2009.

The report includes a number of recommendations addressed to the Norwegian competent authority aimed at rectifying the identified shortcomings and enhancing the control system in place.

Table of contents

1 INTRODUCTION 4

2 SCOPE AND OBJECTIVE OF THE MISSION 4

3 LEGAL BASIS FOR THE MISSION 6

4 BACKGROUND..... 6

5 MAIN FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS..... 7

5.1 LEGISLATION AND IMPLEMENTING MEASURES..... 7

5.2 COMPETENT AUTHORITIES 8

5.3 AUTHORISATION OF TRANSPORTERS 11

5.4 TRAINING COURSES AND CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE 14

5.5 MEANS OF TRANSPORT..... 15

5.6 CHECKS ON TRANSPORT 16

5.7 TRANSPORT DOCUMENTATION 18

5.8 FITNESS OF ANIMALS 19

5.9 TRANSPORT PRACTICES..... 20

5.10 ASSEMBLY CENTRES, CONTROL POSTS AND LIVESTOCK CENTRES 20

5.11 LAYING HEN FARMS 23

6 FINAL MEETING 25

7 RECOMMENDATIONS..... 25

ANNEX 1 - LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMS USED IN THE REPORT 28

ANNEX 2 - RELEVANT LEGISLATION..... 29

ANNEX 3 - REPLY FROM THE NFSA TO THE DRAFT REPORT 30

1 Introduction

The mission took place in Norway from 22 to 31 October 2012. The mission team comprised two inspectors from the EFTA Surveillance Authority (the Authority), an observer from the Food and Veterinary Office of the European Commission (from 22 to 26 October) and a national expert. From 29 to 31 October an officer from the Authority also joined the mission team.

The opening meeting was held with representatives of the Norwegian Food Safety Authority (NFSA) and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food on Monday 22 October 2012 at the head office of the NFSA in Sandnes. The meeting was arranged as a video conference, allowing the head office of the NFSA located in Oslo and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food to participate.

At the meeting, the mission team confirmed the objectives and the itinerary of the mission. The Norwegian representatives provided additional information to that set out in the reply to the Authority's pre-mission document.

Throughout the mission, the mission team was accompanied by representatives of the NFSA head office together with representatives of the relevant regional and district offices.

A final meeting was held with representatives of the NFSA and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in Oslo on 31 October. This meeting was also arranged as a video conference, allowing the participation of the head office of the NFSA located in Sandnes.

The abbreviations used in the report are listed in Annex 1.

2 Scope and objective of the mission

The scope of the mission was to evaluate the Norwegian competent authorities' official controls of animal welfare standards during transport and to evaluate the implementation of requirements aimed at the protection of laying hens at farm level set out in the following legislation:

- a) *Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations;*
- b) *Council Directive 1999/74/EC of 19 July 1999 laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens;*
- c) *Commission Directive 2002/4/EC of 30 January 2002 on the registration of establishments keeping laying hens, covered by Council Directive 1999/74/EC, as amended.*
- d) *Commission Decision 2006/778/EC of 14 November 2006 concerning minimum requirements for the collection of information during the inspections of production sites on which certain animals are kept for farming purposes.*

The main objective of the mission was to assess the Norwegian competent authorities' application of the above mentioned legislation and additional legislation. All legislation referred to in this report is listed in Annex 2 to this document.

The assessment was based on the following main issues:

- a) the legal and administrative measures in place to implement the above requirements;
- b) the control framework established and operated by the competent authorities to ensure the uniform application of these requirements;
- c) other measures to achieve compliance;
- d) the follow-up of controls, including corrective actions;
- e) the status of implementation of corrective measures with respect to the previous mission carried out by the Authority from 7 to 11 September 2009.

In particular, and concerning laying hens, the objective was to evaluate whether the competent authority have achieved compliance with the legislative requirements laid down in Article 5 of Council Directive 1999/74/EC and to verify the actions taken by the competent authority to ensure the ban on the use of unenriched cages for laying hens as from 1 January 2012.

The evaluation included the gathering of relevant information, and appropriate verifications, by means of interviews/discussions, review of documents and records, and on-the-spot inspections, to verify the normal control procedures adopted and measures in place to ensure that necessary corrective actions will be taken when necessary.

The meetings with the competent authorities and the visits during the mission are listed in the following table.

Table 1: Competent authorities and establishments/sites visited during the mission

	Number	Comments
Competent authorities	2	An initial meeting and a final meeting between the mission team and the NFSA
	3	In the districts visited, located in three different regions, representatives of the correspondent regional offices also joined the meetings
Norwegian Public Roads Administration	1	A Driver and Vehicle Licensing Office
Transporters premises	1	A transporter authorised for long journeys (i.e. journeys exceeding eight hours)
Assembly centre	1	A centre approved by the NFSA
Livestock centre	1	Norwegian “ <i>livdyrffjøs</i> ” where animals coming from different holdings are stabled and/or grouped and further distributed
Slaughterhouse	1	A slaughterhouse for swine and ovine
Laying hens farms	3	One farm with enriched cages, one free range farm with access to outdoor area and a farm with both enriched cages and free range

3 Legal basis for the mission

The legal basis for the mission was:

- a) Point 4 of the Introductory Part of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement;
- b) Article 1(e) of Protocol 1 to the Agreement between the EFTA States on the Establishment of a Surveillance Authority and a Court of Justice;
- c) Article 45 of *Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules*, as amended and corrected in the EEA Agreement;
- d) Article 28 of *Regulation (EC) No 1/2005*;
- e) Article 9 of *Council Directive 1999/74/EC*;
- f) *Commission Decision 98/139/EC of 4 February 1998 laying down certain detailed rules concerning on-the-spot checks carried out in the veterinary field by Commission experts in the Member States*.

4 Background

The last mission to Norway regarding the application of European Economic Area (EEA) Agreement legislation related to animal welfare on farms was carried out from 7 to 11 September 2009. The final report from this mission can be found on the Authority's website (www.eftasurv.int). Amongst the conclusions of that mission the following were related to farm inspections concerning laying hens:

- *Compliance with the Annex (1) to Directive 2002/4/EC could not be ensured since data required for registration did not consider the possibility to record the owner of the establishment, if different from the keeper, the farming method(s) according to the definitions referred to under point 2.1 of the same Directive, and the maximum capacity of the establishment in number of birds present at one time.*
- *Compliance with Article 4.1 (1)(d) of Directive 1999/74/EC could not be fully ensured since adequate perches were not available in the barn with laying hens visited by the mission team.*

The NFSA provided the Authority with the following responses as corrective actions and expected time of achieving:

- The register will be developed to contain all data mentioned in Annex (1) to Directive 2002/4/EC and the definitions referred to under point 2.1. Steps will be taken to ensure registration and updating of data on establishments keeping laying hens. Expected time to finalise the corrective action: 31 December 2010.
- These points will be marked as mandatory inspection points in the registration templates (*kravpunktmalene*) in MATS (the electronic operational quality management system for case handling in the NFSA). Expected time to finalise the corrective action: 1 April 2010.

The Authority, based on the information provided by the NFSA, considered the corrective action related to the first conclusion satisfactory and that the second one should be followed-up during the next mission on the same topic (see chapter 5.11).

5 Main findings and conclusions

5.1 Legislation and implementing measures

Legal requirements

Article 7 of the EEA Agreement states that acts referred to or contained in the Annexes to the Agreement are binding upon the Contracting Parties and shall be, or be made, part of their internal legal order.

Article 1(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that only Articles 3 and 27 of the regulation shall apply to: (a) the transport of animals carried out by farmers using agricultural vehicles or means of transport belonging to them in cases where the geographical circumstances call for transport for seasonal transhumance of certain types of animals; (b) transport carried out by farmers, of their own animals, in their own means of transport for a distance of less than 50 km from their holding.

Article 2(m) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 defines ‘long journeys’ for the purposes of the Regulation as journeys exceeding eight hours in total.

Point 1.11 of Chapter III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that animals shall not be tied by the horns, the antlers, the nose rings nor by legs tied together.

Article 5(2) of Directive 1999/74/EC requires that the Member States shall ensure that rearing of laying hens in unenriched cages is prohibited with effect from 1 January 2012.

Point 8 of the Annex to Directive 1999/74 states that all mutilations shall be prohibited, however, the Member States may authorise beak trimming provided it is carried out by qualified staff on chickens that are less than 10 days old and intended for laying.

Findings

In relation to transport and according to national legislation, it is forbidden to transport animals destined to slaughter for more than eight hours. The legislation admits exceptions from this ban in the northern part of the country (Nordland, Troms and Finnmark), if it is not possible to move animals from the holding of origin to any slaughterhouse within eight hours. In these cases, long journeys of up to eleven hours are allowed. The ban against long journeys for animals transported for slaughter does not apply to poultry.

According to national legislation, specific requirements concerning space availability, temperature and duration have been established for transport of reindeer. Under the national rules, reindeer may be transported by the owner or to grazing areas with the legs tied together for up to two hours.

The wording “roll on roll off vessels” used in the relevant EEA legislation was translated in the relevant Norwegian regulation as *rorofartøy*. This word appeared unclear to the NFSA officers met by the mission team.

In relation to laying hens and according to information provided by the NFSA in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, the head office has on several occasions given instructions to ensure focus on the out phasing of unenriched cages. These instructions have been given both in written letters and e-mails to the regional offices, and it has been on the agenda at national meetings with the regional offices and the industry. According to the same information, a total number of six farms using unenriched cages

were still registered. At the initial meeting the NFSA provided updated information, according to this only one farm was still using unenriched cages in Norway.

In Norway pecking material should be available for a minimum period of nine hours as stated in the relevant Norwegian legislation. The Norwegian legislation regarding keeping of laying hens includes a general ban on any mutilation, including beak trimming.

Conclusions

The relevant EEA legislation concerning animal welfare during transport and laying hens included in the scope of this mission has been made part of the Norwegian legal order. For some aspects (e.g. long journeys for animals destined to slaughter, beak trimming) the Norwegian legislation implements stricter requirements than those laid down in the EEA legislation. However, in relation to reindeer, the national legislation permits reindeer to be transported with the legs tied together for up to two hours. In cases where the transport would fall within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, cf. Article 1(2), e.g. where the transport exceeds 50 kilometres or is not carried out by the farmer, this is not in line with point 1.11 of Chapter III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

One farm with unenriched cages is still operating in Norway; this is not in conformity with Article 5(2) of Directive 1999/74/EC requiring that the Member States shall ensure that rearing of laying hens in unenriched cages is prohibited with effect from 1 January 2012.

5.2 Competent authorities¹

Designation of competent authorities and competence of their staff, coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities, enforcement measures

Legal Requirements

Article 4(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires Member States to designate the competent authorities responsible for the official controls set out in the regulation.

Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 requires that efficient and effective coordination and cooperation shall be ensured between all the competent authorities involved in official controls;

Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 states that the competent authority shall ensure that all of its staff performing official controls: (a) receive, for their area of competence, appropriate training enabling them to undertake their duties competently and to carry out official controls in a consistent manner. This training shall cover as appropriate the areas referred to in Annex II, Chapter I; (b) keep up-to-date in their area of competence and receive regular additional training as necessary.

Article 54 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 lays down the action in case of non-compliance and in particular states that when the competent authority identifies non-compliance, it shall take action to ensure that the operator remedies the situation. When deciding what action to take, the competent authority shall take account of the nature of the non-compliance and that operator's past record with regard to non-compliance.

¹ Further information on the organisation of the competent authorities and how official controls are carried out in Norway is given in the country profile available on the Authority's website: <http://www.eftasurv.int/internal-market-affairs/fields-of-work/food-safety/country-profiles/>

Article 55 Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 states that the sanctions provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

Article 25 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that the Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the provisions of this regulation and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The penalties provided for must be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.

Article 26(2) and (3) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 provides that where a competent authority establishes that a transporter has not observed, or a means of transport does not comply with this Regulation, or that a journey took place in breach of this Regulation, it shall notify without delay the competent authority that granted the authorisation to the transporter or the certificate of approval of the means of transport, or the competent authority of the place of departure. Article 26(4) provides that where a competent authority receives such notification it shall, if appropriate, require the transporter to remedy the breaches, subject the transporter to additional checks, or suspend or withdraw the authorisation or the certificate of approval.

Article 27(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that:

(1) The competent authority shall check that the requirements of this Regulation have been complied with, by carrying out non-discriminatory inspections of animals, means of transport and accompanying documents. Such inspections must be carried out on an adequate proportion of the animals transported each year within each Member State, and may be carried out at the same time as checks for other purposes. The proportion of inspections shall be increased where it is established that the provisions of this regulation have been disregarded. The above proportions shall be determined in accordance with the procedures referred to in Article 31(2).

(2) Member States shall submit to the Authority by 30 June each year an annual report for the previous year on the inspections provided for in paragraph 1. The report shall be accompanied by an analysis of the major deficiencies detected and an action plan to address them.

Article 29 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that Member States shall encourage the development of guides to good practice which shall include guidance on compliance with this regulation and in particular with Article 10(1). Such guides shall be drawn up at national level, among a number of Member States, or at Community level. Dissemination and use of national and EEA guides shall be encouraged.

Article 8 of Decision 2006/778 concerning minimum requirements for the collection of information during the inspections of production sites on which certain animals are kept for farming purposes states that by 30 June 2009 at the latest, and subsequently every year not later than 30 June, Member States shall submit to the Authority a report by electronic means concerning the information collected and recorded in accordance with this decision, during inspections carried out during the previous calendar year.

Findings

According to information provided by the NFSA in its reply to the pre-mission document of the Authority, the NFSA is the competent authority for the purpose of the legislative acts falling within the scope of this mission.

According to the same information and as verified by the mission team on the spot, no trainings are provided to the NFSA staff to check the fulfilment of the relevant requirements concerning transport of animals, except for poultry (see chapter 5.6), and the measurements of the limiting factors and relevant requirements establishing the minimum standards for the protection of laying hens (see chapter 5.11).

The mission team had the possibility to verify the level of cooperation between the NFSA and the Norwegian Public Roads Administration (NPRA) concerning approval of means of transport². In particular, there was close cooperation demonstrated between the NFSA and NPRA for developing checklists to be used by the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Offices for checking vehicles used to transport live animals (see chapter 5.5).

In case of non-compliances with animal welfare legislation, the NFSA has different enforcement measures to implement, ranging from guidance related to requirements in the legislation, decision related to corrective actions, fines in case the corrective actions are not implemented within a given deadline (e.g. daily fines that will run until corrective actions have been implemented).

In relation to laying hens farms and the one farm still using unenriched cages in Norway the mission team went through the documentation available and found that the farmer introduced new flocks (for a total of 520 laying hens) in June 2011 and applied for a derogation as he wanted to continue keeping laying hens in unenriched cages until 2016. The NFSA rejected the application for derogation, the final decision made by the head office in September 2011. Since the final decision, no further follow up had been done by the district office until an inspection that was carried out on 8 October 2012. The farmer had not complied with the decision of the NFSA and there were laying hens in unenriched cages at the holding at the time of the inspection. Following this inspection, the farmer was given until 23 November 2012 to depopulate the holding, if this is not done he will have to pay a fine of 10 000 NOK (approximately 1 350 EUR). According to additional information from the NFSA district officer, the farmer planned to start depopulation the week this mission was taking place.

According to the information available in the last report on control of animal transports for the year 2010, 5 760 controls at destination (slaughterhouses) led to 2 922 registered infringements, however, no evidence could be provided that infringements identified at the place of destination led to increased focus on official controls of the place of departure or of the transporters involved. Additional information concerning infringements and notification of infringements specifically within the scope of animal welfare during transport is given in chapter 5.6.

Lack of specific penalties related to the infringements of the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 were pointed out by the mission team along the mission together with the absence of instructions/guidance on the types of penalties which could be issued in consideration of the infringement itself.

The NFSA informed the mission team at the opening meeting that a new regulation concerning enforcement measures in animal welfare cases would be sent for public hearing in the near future. The regulation would *inter alia* give the opportunity for the NFSA to use administrative fines in relation to animal welfare issues. Although difficult to

² See Annex 3 for comments from the NFSA

give a specific time, it was estimated that this new regulation could be implemented during spring/early summer 2013.

The NFSA representatives informed the mission team that no guide to good practice on the interpretation of the requirements laid down in the relevant EEA requirements concerning transport has been drawn up in Norway.

The last report on control of animal transports and holding with farm animals submitted by the NFSA to the Authority referred to controls carried out in 2010. Concerning the year 2011, in June 2012 the Authority was informed by the NFSA that due to technical problems within MATS the report was delayed and that it will be probably be available in September 2012. However, during the initial meeting, the Authority was informed that due to persistence of the problems in the system the report was not yet obtainable.

Conclusions

Norway has designated competent authorities responsible for the official controls falling within the scope of this mission in line with the requirements laid down in the Article 4(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

Efficient and effective coordination and cooperation was ensured between the NFSA and the NPRA involved in official controls related to transporter and vehicle authorisations, in accordance with Article 4(3) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

The competent authorities did not always ensure that all of its staff performing official controls receive appropriate training enabling them to undertake their duties competently and to carry out official controls on transport of live animals and for protection of laying hens in a consistent manner and that they receive regular additional training as necessary as required by Article 6(a) and (b) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

The NFSA has available enforcement measures in line with Article 54 and 55 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004. However, figures available concerning registered infringements at slaughterhouses revealed the inadequate official controls at the place of departure or during transport to ensure that the operator remedies the situation. This is not in line with the requirements laid down in Article 54(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and in Article 26 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Norway has not established rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport as required by Article 25 of the Regulation.

No guides to good practice have been developed by Norway in conformity with the requirements of Article 29 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Norway has not submitted to the Authority by 30 June 2012 the annual report for the year 2011 on the inspections of animals, means of transport and accompanying documents as required by Article 27(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and on the inspections of production sites on which certain animals are kept for farming purposes as required by Article 8 of Decision 2006/778.

5.3 Authorisation of transporters

Legal Requirements

Article 2(x) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 defines as ‘transporter’ any natural or legal person transporting animals on his own account, or for the account of a third party. Article 5(1) of the same regulation states that no person shall contract or subcontract the transport of animals except to transporters authorised in accordance with Article 10(1) or Article 11(1). Article 6(1) of the same regulation states that no person shall act as a transporter unless he holds an authorisation issued by a competent authority pursuant to Article 10(1) or, for long journeys, Article 11(1). A copy of the authorisation shall be made available to the competent authority when the animals are transported. Article 6(2) states that transporters shall notify to the competent authority any changes in relation to the information and documents referred to in Article 10(1) or, for long journeys, Article 11(1), no more than 15 working days from the date the changes took place.

Article 10(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 lays down the requirements for authorising transporters carrying out journeys of less than eight hours. In particular, the applicants must demonstrate that they have sufficient and appropriate staff, equipment and operational procedures to comply with this Regulation and that they do not have records of serious infringements of EEA legislation and/or national legislation on the protection of animals in the three years preceding the date of the application. Article 10(2) states that the competent authority shall issue authorisations in accordance with the specimen set out in Chapter I of Annex III.

Article 11(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 laying down the provisions for authorising transporters carrying out long journeys, in addition to the documentation mentioned in Article 10(1)(b), requires further documents, such as: (i) the valid certificates of competence for drivers and attendants; (ii) the valid certificates of approval for all means of transport by road to be used for long journeys; (iii) details of the procedures enabling transporters to trace and record the movements of road vehicles under their responsibility and to contact the drivers concerned at any time during long journeys; (iv) contingency plans in the event of emergency.

Findings

According to information provided by the NFSA at the initial meeting, companies operating roll on roll off boats, have not been authorised in Norway for transport of animals.

According to information provided by the NFSA in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire, authorisation of transporters is given by the district offices of the NFSA. Transporters submit an application to the district office of the NFSA providing details of the company (name and address), drivers (name and dates of competence course) and license number of the vehicle(s). Annexed to the application is the registration book of the vehicle(s). The registration books seen by the mission team stated that the vehicles were suited for transport of live animals. The mission team noted that the authorisation of transporters is given using a specimen containing relevant information related to identify the transporter and the vehicle. In addition, a letter confirming the authorisation is issued. Such authorisation is valid for not more than five years from the date of issue.

Until June 2012 the NPRA carried out technical inspections of all vehicles for transport of live animals also for journeys lasting less than eight hours (see chapter 5.5). From June 2012, the NPRA only checks conformity of all vehicles (for journeys less and more than eight hours) for horse transport and only vehicles for long journeys for other species. Consequently, information related to the vehicles suitability for animal transport (journeys

lasting less than eight hours for animals other than horses) will not be included in the registration book of vehicles licensed by the NPRA after June 2012.

The NFSA representatives explained that from July 2012 the applicants should, in order to demonstrate that they have sufficient and appropriate staff, equipment and operational procedures, use an own-declaration stating that the vehicles are suitable for transport of animals. The NFSA carries out checks/inspection of the vehicles, e.g. at arrival in slaughterhouses, however, not prior to issuing an authorisation of the transporter. The files seen by the mission team in relation to authorisation of transporters carrying out journeys less than eight hours did not always include a demonstration to the competent authority that the transporter had available competent staff (only the name of the drivers was mentioned and the date of training course attended) or that the transporters have operational procedures at their disposal to enable them to comply with the legal requirements.

Two transporters were authorised in one of the district offices visited by the mission team. For one of them (transporting reindeers) relevant documents such as the application and supporting documents and the authorisation issued by the NFSA were not available; only the approval number was accessible through MATS. For the second one (authorised for long journeys) the authorisation had expired in May 2012 without having been renewed. During the visit to this transporter the mission team was informed of his intention to terminate the live animal transport part of his business. Also for this transporter no supporting documents related to the authorisation were available. The responsibility for this particular transporter had been transferred from a different district office in 2009. The lack of supporting documents was explained to the mission team to be due to this transfer of responsibilities. The transporter confirmed to the mission team that no changes in relation to the information related to his activity (e.g. new drivers and new trucks) had been notified to the NFSA even though several such changes had occurred in recent years. Only upon request from the district office had the transporter provided the NFSA with some information in relation to the drivers. At the beginning of October 2012 the NFSA asked the transporter to be informed of the attendance of his drivers to the courses related to the certificate of competence provided by the designated bodies and for one of the drivers evidence of this was not yet available at the time of the mission.

The transporter was audited by the NFSA in March 2010 after information collected by the district office in relation to transport of animals exceeding eight hours of journey time. The audit lasted a full day and the main conclusion was the lack of adequate documentation related to the transports carried out. The corrective action provided by the transporter was a table used as transport log for all national transport providing the relevant details but still missing some information (e.g. the expected time of journey). The contingency plan in the event of emergencies was not available.

Conclusions

Companies with roll on roll off vessels are not authorised as animal transporters in Norway; this is not in compliance with Article 6(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Transporters are in principle authorised by the NFSA in accordance with the relevant requirements laid down in Articles 10 and 11 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. However, a transporter was operating despite his authorisation having expired which is not in compliance with Article 6(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

The files seen in relation to authorisation of the transporters for journeys less than eight hours did not always demonstrate that the transporter had appropriate staff, equipment and

that they have operational procedures at their disposal to enable them to comply with Article 10(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

No notification of the changes to the information and documents referred to in Article 10(1) or, for long journeys, in Article 11(1) were notified to the NFSA by the transporters as required by Article 6(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Contingency plans in the event of emergencies were not submitted by the transporter authorised for long journeys as required by Article 11(1)(b)(iv) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

5.4 Training courses and certificate of competence

Legal Requirements

Article 17 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 establishes that training courses shall be available for personnel of transporters and assembly centres. The certificate of competence for drivers and attendants of road vehicles transporting domestic Equidae or domestic animals of bovine, ovine, caprine or porcine species or poultry shall be granted in accordance with Annex IV. The certificate of competence shall be drawn up in the official language(s) of the Member State of issue and in English when the driver or attendant is likely to operate in another Member State. The certificate of competence shall be issued by the competent authority or body designated for this purpose by the Member States and in accordance with the specimen set out in Chapter III of Annex III. The scope of the said certificate of competence may be limited to a specific species or group of species.

Findings

According to information provided by the NFSA in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority and verified by the mission team on the spot, approved training courses for drivers/attendants are available. The courses include examination. Two designated bodies offer training courses for different species of animals transported. The unit in the NFSA responsible for approval of training courses is based in a regional office. For transport of bovine, ovine, caprine, porcine species and poultry there is one approved course offered by a designated body. This course takes place twice a year for drivers/attendants who transport bovine, ovine, caprine and porcine species while one or two (depending on the demand) course(s) is/are organized by the designated body for drivers/attendants transporting poultry.

For transport of horses, there is one approved course offered by another designated body which normally offers two courses per year (spring and autumn).

The two designated bodies are independent trade organizations, and have been given the authority to arrange the final examination. The formal certificate of competence is given by the NFSA at district level, based on information from the course providers (course diploma is issued for all the participants who has successfully completed the course).

A total number of 1 203 persons have a valid certificate of competence in Norway as of September 2012.

Conclusion

Training courses for personnel of transporters and assembly centres are available in Norway as required by Article 17(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005; certificates of

competence are issued in accordance with the requirements laid down in Article 17(2) of the same Regulation.

5.5 Means of transport

Legal Requirements

Article 7(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that no person shall transport animals by road for a long journey unless the means of transport has been inspected and approved under Article 18(1) of the same Regulation.

Article 18(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that the competent authority or body designated by a Member State shall grant a certificate of approval for means of transport by road used for long journeys upon application, provided that the means of transport: (a) are not the subject of an application submitted to or an approval by another competent authority in the same or another Member State; (b) have been inspected by the competent authority or body designated by a Member State and found to comply with the requirements of Chapters II and VI of Annex I applicable to the design, the construction and the maintenance of means of transport by road used for long journeys.

Chapter II of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 details the requirements (as referred to in Article 6(3), Article 8(1), Article 9(1) and Article (2)(a)) of means of transport and in particular Point 1 lists the provisions for all means of transport, including how they shall operate. Chapter VI of Annex I to the same Regulation states the additional provisions for long journeys of domestic Equidae and domestic animals of bovine, ovine, caprine and porcine species; in particular Point 2 provides requirements for water supply for transport by road, rail or sea containers.

Findings

According to information provided by the NFSA in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority, the district offices of the NFSA approve means of transport. Before approval of means of transport, the vehicles are controlled by the NPRA, Driver and Vehicle Licensing Office, which provides a filled in check list to the NFSA. This checklist is developed in cooperation between NFSA and NPRA. The checklists include the technical requirements for vehicles to be used for transport of live animals and guidance from the NFSA to the NPRA staff. The results from this inspection will be the main basis for the formal approval by the NFSA. Nevertheless, the district office is responsible for collecting any other information necessary to evaluate the vehicle if the check list from the Driver and Vehicle Licensing Office do not give sufficient information. The approval of the vehicle lasts five years. Until June 2012 the NPRA carried out technical inspections of all vehicles for transport of live animals, however, after this date the NPRA only checks conformity of vehicles for long journeys for *horses*, bovine, ovine, caprine or porcine species (see chapter 5.3)³.

The mission team visited the premises of an NPRA Driver and Vehicle Licensing Office and the NPRA staff carried out a simulation exercise on how to perform an inspection of a vehicle. The NPRA had available equipment to measure e.g. the slope of the ramp.

The mission team observed the unloading of animals at a slaughterhouse and noted that, in most cases, the gates were kept closed, however it was also seen that the gates were kept opened during the descent of the upper deck so that animals could have jumped or fallen down. Not all vehicles were carrying equipment for loading and unloading of animals (i.e.

³ See Annex 3 for comments from the NFSA

at least two trailers). It was also observed that the full floor of two of the trucks was not levelled, as approximately the last 2 meters presented with a slight slope leaving animals in this section standing unlevelled. The upper decks of the inspected trucks did not present a flooring surface that minimised the leakage of urine or faeces onto the lower floor.

The mission team visited a transporter and inspected the only vehicle belonging to his fleet which was authorised for long journeys. As mentioned in chapter 5.4, the vehicle's approval had expired in September 2012 and had not yet been renewed by the NFSA. The mission team noted that the vehicle was prepared for transport of animals with new chippings/sawdust on the floor. The vehicle was generally in excellent condition, however, equipment for water supply, in particular a tank connected to drinking devices within the compartments, was not permanently installed. It was also observed that the full floor was not levelled, as the last 2,3 meters presented with a slight slope leaving animals in this section standing unlevelled. A simulation of the use of the navigation system was provided to the mission team during this visit.

Conclusions

The approval of the vehicle is given in conformity with the requirements laid down in Articles 7 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. However, the approval of the vehicle observed by the mission team had expired. The use of the navigation system was, in the case observed by the mission team, in conformity with the requirements laid down in Article 11(2) and Chapter VI(4) of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Some non conformities in respect of the requirements laid down in Chapter II and III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 were observed. In particular flooring surface did not always minimise the leakage of urine or faeces as required in Point 1.1(h) and not all vehicles were carrying equipment for loading and unloading as laid down in Point 2.2 of Chapter II. Furthermore, safety barriers were not always closed so as to prevent animals falling escaping during loading and unloading operations as required in Point 1.4 (b) of Chapter III.

5.6 Checks on transport

Legal Requirements

Article 15(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires the competent authority to carry out at any stage of the long journey appropriate checks on a random or targeted basis to verify that declared journey times are realistic and that the journey complies with this Regulation and in particular that travel times and rest periods have complied with the limits set out in Chapter V of Annex I.

Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires the competent authority to ensure that its staff are duly trained and equipped to check data recorded by the recording equipment for road transport as provided for by Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85 (tachographs), and the navigation system.

Article 27(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires the competent authority to check that the requirements of this Regulation have been complied with by carrying out non-discriminatory inspections of animals, means of transport and accompanying documents. Such inspections must be carried out on an adequate proportion of animals transported each year within the Member State.

Article 8(c) Directive 91/68/EEC as regards reinforcement of controls on movements of ovine and caprine animals states that Member States shall ensure that the transporters referred to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 meet the following additional conditions: (a) for the carriage of animals they must use means of transport which are: (1) constructed in such a way that the animal faeces, litter or feed cannot leak or fall out of the vehicle, and (2) cleaned and disinfected immediately after every animal transport or that of any product which could affect animal health and if necessary before any new loading of animals, using disinfectants officially authorised by the competent authority.

Findings

According to information provided by the NFSA in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority a number of Common Veterinary Entry Documents for animals from third countries to Norway and of Intra Trade Animal Health Certificates for the EEA to and from Norway have been issued (e.g. in 2012: 15 bovines to Lithuania in one consignment, 35 pigs to Estonia in one consignment, in 2011 39 sheep in two consignments from Denmark to Norway and 233 pigs in 14 consignments from Norway to Sweden, etc.). According to the last report (2010) available from the NFSA on the inspections of animals, means of transport and accompanying documents (see chapter 5.2), out of a total of 5 759 controls concerning road transport, 5 671 took place at destination (slaughterhouses), 17 at departure, 13 during transport and 58 at staging points or transfer points. No controls were reported on railway and air transport; one control was performed on sea transport. Transports utilising roll on roll off ferries for up to four hours were not uncommon according to the information received on-the-spot; however, the mission team was informed that, at present, no checks on transport of live animals are carried out at that level. NFSA representatives confirmed to the mission team that controls on animal welfare along the journeys were in practice not carried out except at slaughterhouses. Representatives of the head office of the NFSA stated that there are very few long journeys within Norway⁴.

According to information provided to the mission team by NFSA representatives there is no training organised for its staff to check data recorded by tachographs or navigation systems. The NFSA explained to the mission team that the reason why these courses are not organized relies on the fact that very few long journeys (apart for registered horses) take places in, from or to Norway. For the same reason no guidelines on how to evaluate that the journey log submitted by the organizer is realistic have been prepared nor conceived by the NFSA.

A district officer informed the mission team of transports taking place of bovines (calves, often unweaned of 1-2 months of age and between 60-110 kg live weight, and dairy cows) where the place of destination was in their own district while place of departure was in other Norwegian regions (e.g. Finnmark or Trøndelag). The estimated time of journey could be, according to the district officer, up to and even more than 20 hours from the first animal is loaded in the vehicle. However, these transports were carried out by vehicles not approved for long journeys and without ensuring that watering and feeding intervals, journeys times and resting periods were respected. The district officer took action informing the regional office on the above mentioned observations (in at least five cases during winter and summer 2012). However, no evidence of further action or follow up could be provided. The only feedback was sent to the district officer by the transporters responsible stating that no journey logs were in use⁵.

⁴ *See Annex 3 for comments from the NFSA*

⁵ *See Annex 3 for comments from the NFSA*

According to the national legislation (see chapter 5.1) transport of animals for slaughter for more than eight hours is banned in Norway. In Nordland, Troms and Finnmark animals may be transported for up to eleven hours if no slaughterhouse can be reached within eight hours. A district officer informed the mission team that animals were transported to a slaughterhouse in breach of the national ban on long journeys. The slaughterhouse is not located in any of the three northernmost counties, there are slaughterhouses located closer and the transport time exceeded eight hours, i.e. long journeys. The mission team noted that, according to information provided by the NFSA, the requirements for long journeys were not taken into account for these transports.

The NFSA confirmed that no training, except for poultry, is provided to the district officers to check the relevant requirements concerning transport of other animals (e.g. calculation of ramps' angle, and required number of fans to ensure sufficient ventilation, temperature monitoring, water supply and the recording equipment for road transport as tachographs and navigation system, compilation of journey log and how to check the realistic time of journey).

In the slaughterhouse visited the mission team was informed by the NFSA that trucks transporting ovine animals are authorised to leave the slaughterhouse without cleaning and disinfection if they are going back to the same farm from where the previous consignment of animals was delivered.

Conclusions

There is not a systematic national approach ensuring official controls at all stages of transport of animals. Official controls concerning the welfare of animals during transport are almost exclusively carried out at arrival at slaughterhouses facilities missing controls at place of departure, on roads and on roll-on-roll-off ferries. This is not in compliance with the requirements laid down in Articles 15(1) and 27(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

The NFSA staff has not been duly trained and equipped to check data recorded by the recording equipment for road transport as provided for by Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85; and the navigation system as required by Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005

Some of the means of transport for ovine animals were not cleaned and disinfected immediately after every animal transport as required by Article 8(c)(1)(a) of Directive 2003/50/EC.

5.7 Transport documentation

Legal Requirements

Article 4(e) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that no person shall transport animals without carrying documentation in the means of transport stating the expected duration of the intended journey.

Findings

The documentation accompanying animals arriving at the slaughterhouse and checked by the mission team both at the slaughterhouse, the assembly centre and the transporter visited, were not reporting the expected duration of the intended journey. The transport documents stated the time of loading at the place of departure and the drivers would fill in the time of unloading at the place of arrival.

Conclusions

In Norway the documentation in the means of transport does not states the expected duration of the intended journey as required by Article 4(e) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

5.8 Fitness of animals

Legal Requirements

Article 3 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 requires that animals are transported in a way unlikely to cause injury or undue suffering to them, and that animals are fit for the intended journey. Article 6(3) requires transporters to transport animals in accordance with the technical rules set out in Annex I to this Regulation.

Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that keepers of animals at the place of departure, transfer or destination shall ensure that the technical rules set out in Chapters I (Fitness for transport) and III (transport practices) of Section I, Annex I to the above mentioned regulation are met.

Article 12 of Council Directive 93/119/EC requires injured or diseased animals to be slaughtered or killed on the spot. However, their transport may be authorised by the competent authority provided that such transport does not entail further suffering for the animals.

Regulation (EC) No 854/2004, Annex I, Section I, Chapter II C requires the official veterinarian at slaughterhouses to verify compliance with EEA rules on animal welfare during transport.

Findings

During the visit to a slaughterhouse the mission team observed unloading of consignments of sheep and pigs for slaughtering. One pig showed severe lameness at the time of unloading, the pig was not able to walk as one of the hind legs showed severe swelling of the joints and the official veterinarian suspected possible fracture. Because of this finding the driver was asked by the official veterinarian to take immediate action. According to the Norwegian legislation, all means of transport should have available equipment for killing animals unfit for transport. All drivers should also receive training in a slaughterhouse in order to learn how to kill animals. The driver used a captive bolt to stun and tried then to bleed the animal. The driver did not seem familiar with the procedure and in addition the knife used appeared to be blunt *representing an increased risk for* prolonged suffering of the animal. The driver demonstrated poor maintenance of the equipment and a scarce knowledge on how to deal with this emergency situation. The pig was slaughtered separately and labelled in order to make a full *post mortem* report; according to this there was only arthritis and no fracture of the leg⁶.

Conclusions

Compliance with Articles 3, 6(3) and 8(1), as well as Chapter I of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 was not ensured as an animal clearly unfit for transport had nevertheless been transported to a slaughterhouse.

Conformity with Article 12 of Council Directive 93/119/EC was not ensured as an injured/diseased animal had not been killed on the spot, nor had its transport to the slaughterhouse been authorised by the competent authority of the place of departure.

⁶ *See Annex 3 for comments from the NFSA*

5.9 Transport practices

Legal Requirements

Point 1.12 of Chapter III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that animals shall be handled and transported separately in the following cases: (a) animals of different species; (d) sexually mature males from females; (e) animals with horns from animals without horns.

Point 1.13 of Chapter III of Annex I to the same Regulation states that points (a), (b), (c) and (e) of paragraph 1.12 shall not apply where the animals have been raised in compatible groups, are accustomed to each other, where separation will cause distress or where females are accompanied by dependent young.

Findings

During the visit to the slaughterhouse the mission team was told that at times more than one species is transported in the same truck. It was explained that in these cases the animals of different species are in separate rooms. However, the mission team observed that sexually mature males were transported with females and maintained together in the lairage after unloading. It was also noted that animals with horns were not separated from animals without horns. The district officer responsible for the official controls at slaughterhouse explained that any animal causing excess unrest among the animals in the lairage should be removed from the group. It was also explained that there were no guidelines/instructions available on the understanding of when horns could or should be considered a danger for other animals. Nevertheless, the official veterinarian explained that in her opinion outward pointing horns would be a danger and that such animals present in the lairage should have been separated from the animals without horns.

Conclusion:

Transport practices observed by the mission team were not always in conformity with the requirements set down in Point 1.12(d) and (e) of Chapter III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and concerning separation for sexually mature males from females and animals with horns from animals without horns.

5.10 Assembly centres, Control posts and Livestock centres

Legal Requirements

Article 1(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states that only Article 3 and 27 of the Regulation is to apply to the transport of animals by farmers using means of transport belonging to them in cases where geographical circumstances call for transport for seasonal transhumance of certain types of animals or of the farmers' own animals for up to 50 kilometres.

Article 2 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 provides definitions within the purposes of this Regulation and in particular:

- (b) 'assembly centres' means places such as holdings, collection centres and markets, at which domestic Equidae or domestic animals of bovine, ovine, caprine or porcine species originating from different holdings are grouped together to form consignments;
- (h) 'control post' means control posts are referred to in Regulation (EC) No 1255/97, i.e. places where animals are rested for at least 12 hours or more;
- (j) 'journey' means the entire transport operation from the place of departure to the place of destination, including any unloading, accommodation and loading occurring at intermediate points in the journey;

- (m) ‘long journey’ means a journey that exceeds 8 hours, starting from when the first animal of the consignment is moved;
- (r) ‘place of departure’ means the place at which the animal is first loaded on to a means of transport provided that it had been accommodated there for at least 48 hours prior to the time of departure. However, assembly centres approved in accordance with EEA veterinary legislation may be considered as place of departure provided that:
- (i) the distance travelled between the first place of loading and the assembly centre is less than 100 km; or
 - (ii) the animals have been accommodated with sufficient bedding, untied, if possible, and watered for at least six hours prior to the time of departure from the assembly centre;
- (s) ‘place of destination’ means the place at which an animal is unloaded from a means of transport and (i) accommodated for at least 48 hours prior to the time of departure; or (ii) slaughtered;
- (t) ‘place of rest or transfer’ means any stop during the journey which is not a place of destination, including a place where animals have changed the means of transport, with or without being unloaded.

Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 is specific for assembly centres and states that:

1. Operators of assembly centres shall ensure that animals are treated in accordance with the technical rules set out in Chapters I (fitness for transport) and III (transport practices), section 1, of Annex I.
2. Operators of assembly centres that are approved in accordance with EEA veterinary legislation, i.e. legislation listed in Chapter I of Annex A to Directive 90/425/EEC and any subsequent implementing rules shall in addition fulfil certain other requirements.

Chapter III of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 states the duties and obligations of the competent authorities and in particular Articles 11, 15 and 18 are specifically dedicated to long journeys.

Point 8 of the Annex to Council Directive 98/58/EC states that materials to be used for the construction of accommodation must not be harmful to the animals and must be capable of being thoroughly cleaned and disinfected. Point 9 of the same Directive states that accommodation and fittings for securing animals shall be constructed and maintained so that there are no sharp edges or protrusions likely to cause injury to the animals.

Findings:

According to information provided by the NFSA in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority in relation to premises where animals are rested before further transport to a final destination, the following centres were operation in Norway: two approved assembly centres, one approved control post, six “livestock centres” (*livdyrfjøs*). During the mission, the NFSA informed the Authority that there was an additional *livdyrfjøs*, i.e. there are seven *livdyrfjøs* in total in Norway. According to information provided by the NFSA in the initial meeting, *livdyrfjøs* are places where animals may be unloaded during transport and stay for short periods or overnight before transported further to a place of destination).

A *livdyrfjøs* visited by the mission team were authorised by the relevant competent authorities in April 2000 according to the Norwegian Regulation No 17 of 10 January 1985 on welfare of animals for commercial trade. The premises had been temporarily

approved as an assembly centre in relation to an export of bovines to another EEA state which took place in 2004. The premises had been inspected prior to that approval and found suitable as an assembly centre for bovines. The approval was limited to one consignment, and no approval number was issued by the competent authority. The importing EEA State had at the time agreed to accept the temporary approval for the specific consignment. No further consignments of live animals had been transported from the *livdyrffjøs* to another EEA Member State since 2004.

According to the district officer responsible for the official control of this *livdyrffjøs*, animals were currently not kept at the facilities; according to his knowledge the premises were used only as storage for wool. During the visit, however, the mission team found evidence of the recent presence of animals (both bovines and swine). The mission team met the operator in charge of the *livdyrffjøs* and was informed that the majority of animals traded by him would be transported directly from place of departure (holding of origin) to the place of destination (holding of destination). Transactions of approximately 4 500 bovine and 150 000 pigs were handled by this operator in a year. Of these animals only modest amounts pass physically through the *livdyrffjøs*; approximately 45 calves and 750 piglets per year. Animals are lodged for some hours up to a night meaning that the time from the first animal was loaded at the initial place of departure until the animal was unloaded at the place of destination could exceed eight hours. The competent authority explained to the mission team that, in cases where the animals were lodged at the premises for a night, they considered the *livdyrffjøs* as a new place of departure, i.e. the starting point for a new journey.

The following was observed by the mission team visiting the premises:

- No cleaning of litter and disinfection was carried out since the previous consignment of calves (according to the operator the consignment took place a week before the visit) while a new consignment was expected to take place the same day of visit.
- Premises dedicated to calves also contained several items used for other purposes than trade in animals (e.g. supermarket trolleys, equipment for the adjacent slaughterhouse, storage of wool etc).
- In the facilities dedicated to the trade of piglets unclean areas were noted. Uncovered drainages with a diameter and a similar depth of approximately 25 cm presenting a risk to the safety of the animals were also present in the middle of resting rooms.
- The operator informed the mission team that he had received a training course offered by the designated body.

The mission team visited one of two NFSA approved assembly centres in Norway. This centre was collecting sheep from different farms in a municipality. After a maximum resting period of one night the sheep are loaded onto trucks and transported to a slaughterhouse. The assembly centre was not used or approved for intra-EEA trade. The approval of the assembly centre was granted under certain conditions, e.g. limited to sheep from the municipality only. 90 % of the sheep passing through the assembly centre originate from farms situated within a distance less than 10 km from the centre; the maximum distance is less than 15km. The operator met by the mission team was an experienced farmer, trained by the designated body. He explained to the mission team that only healthy sheep are allowed to enter the facilities. The facilities had a wooden floor and some gaps were present; evident accumulation of faeces underneath the wooden floor was also noted in the absence of a drainage system. The faeces underneath the floor had not been removed since the centre started its operation in February 2011. Since then

approximately 3 000 sheep have been transported to and from this centre. No reports of inspections carried out by the NFSA were available. The district officer provided the mission team with photos taken during the single visit to the premises, which had not been an inspection. The NFSA representatives interviewed by the mission team explained that, according to their understanding, the centre was the place of departure, i.e. the journey time was considered the time from departure from the centre until unloading in a slaughterhouse maximum 4 hours away.

Conclusions

Assembly centres have been approved by the NFSA, however, not in accordance with the relevant legislation on intra-EEA trade and can therefore not be considered “approved” assembly centres for the purposes of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

As the *livdyrffjøs* cannot be considered an ‘approved’ assembly centre for the purposes of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, the *livdyrffjøs* cannot be considered as a new place of departure unless the animals are accommodated there for at least 48 hours prior to the next departure, cf. Article 2(r) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. Accordingly, for animals passing through such *livdyrffjøs*, the total journey time will in many cases exceed eight hours. However, compliance with the relevant requirements related to long journeys had not been ensured, e.g. Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 (requirements for long journey transporter authorisation) and Article 18 (certificate of approval of means of transport by road), as well as Chapter VI of Annex I to the Regulation.

Nevertheless, in instances where the transport from the holding of origin to an assembly centre falls outside the scope of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 as defined in Article 1(2), e.g. where the transport is carried out by the farmer himself over a distance shorter than 50 km, the assembly centre can be considered as the (first) place of departure and the total journey time may be calculated from this starting point.

The requirements in Points 8 and 9 of the Annex to Council Directive 98/58/EC were not fully complied with as the materials used for the construction of accommodation at the assembly centre visited were not capable of being thoroughly cleaned and disinfected and the accommodation was not constructed to prevent injury to the animals.

5.11 Laying hen farms

Legal Requirements

Article 8 of Directive 1999/74/EC requires the competent authority to carry out checks to monitor compliance with the requirements of this Directive.

Article 6 of Directive 1999/74/EC lays down provisions applicable to rearing in enriched cages, including limiting factors with regard to the number of hens that can be present in the same cage. Article 6(1)(d) states that Member States shall ensure that after 1 January 2002 laying hens in cages must have appropriate perches providing at least 15 cm per hen.

Commission Directive 2002/4/EC requires Member States to establish a system for registering every production site covered by the scope of Council Directive 1999/74/EC. The last paragraph of Point 1 of the Annex to this Directive requires the registration of the maximum capacity of an establishment in number of birds present at one time.

Findings

According to information provided by the NFSA in the reply to the pre-mission questionnaire of the Authority Directive 2002/4/EC is implemented by the Norwegian Regulation No 1494 of 12 December 2001 on the keeping of poultry. According to this Regulation anyone who farm or intend to farm poultry is obliged to provide information of the poultry husbandry to the district offices. The notification shall contain the following information:

- The name of owner and address of premises
- The holding registration number
- The number of poultry usually on the premises
- The type of poultry holding

Holdings with laying hens are visited annually because of requirements in the *Salmonella* surveillance programme. Most of the regions report that animal welfare inspections are carried out at the same time.

In MATS there are specific check lists (*kravpunktmaler*) for each type of rearing systems. These check lists are used both as a guidance for the inspectors, and as a management tool for the central level.

The mission team observed that no measurements were carried out by the competent authorities concerning the limiting factors and relevant requirements establishing the minimum standards for the protection of laying hens. The NFSA officers explained to the mission team they rely on the technical information provided by the constructor of the laying hens' cages. In addition, the maximum capacity allowed to the farmer and based on the rules on agricultural production in Norway, seemed to them being always less in comparison to real capacity of the facilities installed.

Only in one district visited were reports available of inspections that included calculations and evaluation of the minimum requirements applicable to laying hens. In that district, the inspector used his own check list based on these requirements to evaluate whether the situation on the farm was respecting the requirements.

During a visit to a farm with enriched cages, the mission team pointed out that the length of the usable perches was only around 35 cm out of the 60 cm of total length of the perch as the other 25 cm were touching the nest which made them unusable. Taking this aspect into account made the cage suitable for 2,3 hens instead of the nine present/authorised in the cage. In another farm with enriched cages, the cages had two parallel perches distanced 20 cm from the wall of the cages and with 20 cm between each perch. The NFSA had not evaluated the appropriateness of the perch arrangements in either of the cases mentioned.

A maximum capacity of the different establishments is registered in MATS; however, the mission team noted that the maximum capacity registered in MATS was not established by an evaluation of the limiting requirements for laying hens. In almost all cases except in one district, the number in MATS reflected the maximum allowed number of birds in relation to the Norwegian Regulation on production restrictions. The distinguishing numbers identifying the Norwegian establishments are composed by a digit which is not indicating the farming method followed by the code of Norway.

Conclusions

Compliance with Article 8 of Directive 1999/74/EC was not always ensured as inspections to monitor compliance with the provisions of this Directive were not carried out in all districts visited.

Appropriate perches providing at least 15 cm per hen were not always accessible in some of the farms visited. This is not in conformity with Article 6(1)(d) of Directive 1999/74/EC and corresponds to the same conclusion already reported by the Authority after the previous mission on animal welfare carried out in 2009 (see chapter 4 of this report).

The maximum capacity of the establishment does not provide the information on the establishment as required in Point 1 of the Annex to Directive 2002/4/EC. Furthermore, the distinguishing number is not composed of a digit indicating the farming method in accordance with point 2.1 followed by the code of the Member State according to point 2.2 of the above mentioned Annex. These inconsistencies were also reported after the previous mission on animal welfare carried out in 2009 (see chapter 4 of this report).

6 Final meeting

A final meeting was held with representatives of the NFSA and the Ministry of Agriculture and Food in Oslo on Wednesday 31 October 2012. At this meeting, the mission team presented its main findings and some preliminary conclusions of the mission. At the meeting the mission team also explained that, based on a more detailed assessment of the information received during the mission, additional conclusions and recommendations could be included in the report.

The NFSA did not have any objections to the observations made and the preliminary conclusions presented.

7 Recommendations

Norway should notify the Authority, within two months of receiving the final report, by way of written evidence, of the corrective actions taken and a plan for corrective measures and actions, including a timetable for completion of measures still outstanding, relevant to all the recommendations hereunder. The Authority should also be kept informed of the completion of the measures included in the timetable.

No	Recommendation
<i>Legislation and implementing measures</i>	
1	The competent authorities should ensure that transports of reindeer that fall within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, as laid down in Article 1(2) of the Regulation, comply with the prohibition on tying animals by the legs in point 1.11 of Chapter III of Annex I to the Regulation.
2	The competent authorities should ensure that no farms with unenriched cages are operating in Norway as required by Article 5(2) of Directive 1999/74/EC.
<i>Designation of competent authorities and competence of their staff, coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities, enforcement measures</i>	
3	The competent authorities should ensure that all of its staff performing official controls receive appropriate training enabling them to undertake their duties competently and to carry out official controls on transport of live animals and for protection of laying hens in a consistent manner and that they receive regular additional training as necessary as required by Article 6 (a) and (b) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

4	The competent authorities should ensure that adequate official controls at the place of departure or during transport to ensure that the operator remedies the situation are carried out in line with Article 54(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and Article 26 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
5	The competent authorities should establish rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented; those provisions shall also be notified to the Authority as required by Article 25 of the above mentioned Regulation.
6	The competent authorities should encourage the development of guides to good practice as laid down in Article 29 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
7	The competent authorities should submit to the Authority the annual report for the year 2011 on the inspections of animals, means of transport and accompanying documents as required by Article 27(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and on the inspections of production sites on which certain animals are kept for farming purposes as required by Article 8 of Decision 2006/778.
<i>Authorisation of transporters</i>	
8	The competent authorities should ensure that companies with roll on roll off vessels are authorised as transporters and that transporters are not operating without a valid transporter authorisation as required by Article 6(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
9	The competent authorities should ensure that authorisation is granted to transporters only where the applicants have demonstrated that they have appropriate staff, equipment and that they have operational procedures at their disposal to enable them to comply with Article 10(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
10	The competent authorities should ensure that changes to the information and documents referred to in Article 10(1) or, for long journeys, in Article 11(1) are notified by the transporters as required by Article 6(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
11	The competent authorities should ensure that contingency plans in the event of emergencies are submitted by the transporters authorised for long journeys as required by Article 11(1)(b)(iv) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
<i>Means of transport</i>	
12	The competent authorities should ensure that the vehicles carrying out long journeys are approved and have valid certificates of approval as required by Articles 7 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
13	The competent authorities should ensure fulfilment of the requirements laid down in Chapter II of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, in particular related to flooring surface minimizing the leakage of urine or faeces (Point 1.1(h), and suitable equipment for loading and unloading (Point 2.2) and in Chapter III of the same Annex related to safety barriers to prevent animals falling escaping during loading and unloading operations (Point 1.4 (b)).
<i>Checks on transport</i>	
14	The competent authorities should ensure that official controls are carried out at all stages of transport of animals in conformity with the requirements laid down in Articles 15(1) and 27(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
15	The competent authorities should ensure that their staff is duly trained and equipped to check data recorded by the recording equipment for road transport as provided for by Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85 and the navigation system as required by Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

16	The competent authorities should ensure that all means of transport for ovine animals are cleaned and disinfected immediately after every animal transport as required by Article 8(c)(1)(a) of Directive 91/68/EC.
<i>Transport documentation</i>	
17	The competent authorities should ensure that the documentation in the means of transport states the expected duration of the intended journey as required by Article 4(e) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
<i>Fitness of animals</i>	
18	The competent authorities should ensure that animals are transported in accordance with the requirements laid down in Articles 3, 6(3) and 8(1) as well as Chapter I of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
19	The competent authorities should ensure that injured/diseased animals are transported to the slaughterhouse only when authorised by the competent authority of the place of departure as required by Article 12 of Council Directive 93/119/EC.
<i>Transport practices</i>	
20	The competent authorities should ensure that transport practices are in conformity with the requirements set down in Point 1.12(d) and (e) of Chapter III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 concerning separation of sexually mature males from females and animals with horns from animals without horns.
<i>Assembly centres, Control posts and Livestock centres</i>	
21	The competent authorities should ensure that, when the total amount of journey time exceed the eight hours, the relevant requirements related to long journeys as set out in Articles 11, 15 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, as well as Chapter VI of Annex I to the Regulation are complied with.
22	The competent authorities should ensure that assembly centres comply with the requirements of Points 8 and 9 of the Annex to Council Directive 98/58/EC in particular with respect to the materials used for the construction of accommodation which were not capable of being thoroughly cleaned and disinfected and not constructed to prevent injury to the animals.
<i>Laying hen farms</i>	
23	The competent authorities should ensure that inspections to monitor compliance with the provisions of Directive 1999/74/EC are carried out in accordance with Article 8 of the same Directive.
24	The competent authorities should ensure that appropriate perches providing at least 15 cm per hen are always accessible as required by Article 6(1)(d) of Directive 1999/74/EC.
25	The competent authorities should ensure that the information on the establishment concerning maximum capacity corresponds to Point 1 of the Annex to Directive 2002/4/EC and that the distinguishing number is composed of a digit indicating the farming method in accordance with point 2.1 followed by the code of the Member State according to point 2.2 of the above mentioned Annex.

Annex 1 - List of abbreviations and terms used in the report

Authority	EFTA Surveillance Authority
EC	European Community
EEA	European Economic Area
EEA Agreement	Agreement on the European Economic Area
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
Long journey	Means a journey that exceeds eight hours starting from when the first animal of the consignment is moved
MATS	Electronic operational quality management system for case handling in the NFSA
NFSA	Norwegian Food Safety Authority
NOK	Norwegian <i>Krone</i>
NPRA	Norwegian Public Road Administration

Annex 2 - Relevant legislation

The following EEA legislation was also taken into account in the context of this mission:

- a) The Act referred to at point 9.1.2 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 93/119/EC of 22 December 1993 on the protection of animals at the time of slaughter or killing*, as amended;
- b) The Act referred to at point 9.1.6 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 98/58/EC of 20 July 1998 concerning protection of animals kept for farming purposes*;
- c) The Act referred to at point 9.1.8 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 1999/74/EC of 19 July 1999 laying down minimum standards for the protection of laying hens*;
- d) The Act referred to at point 9.1.10 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations*;
- e) The Act referred to at point 9.2.2 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Directive 2002/4/EC of 30 January 2002 on the registration of establishments keeping laying hens, covered by Council Directive 1999/74/EC*, as amended;
- f) The Act referred to at point 9.2.4 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Decision 2006/778/EC of 14 November 2006 concerning minimum requirements for the collection of information during the inspections of production sites on which certain animals are kept for farming purposes*;
- g) The Act referred to at point 1.1.11 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules*, as corrected, amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;
- h) The Act referred to at point 1.1.12 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Regulation (EC) No 854/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption*, as amended and as adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;
- i) The Act referred to at point 1.2.74 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Commission Decision 98/139/EC laying down certain detailed rules concerning on-the-spot checks in the veterinary field*;
- j) The Act referred to at point 4.1.2 of Chapter I of Annex I to the EEA Agreement, *Council Directive 91/68/EEC of 28 January 1991 on animal health conditions governing intra-Community trade in ovine and caprine animals*, as amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex I to that Agreement;
- k) The Act referred to at point 21 of Annex XIII to the EEA Agreement, *Council Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85 of 20 December 1985 on the introduction of recording equipment in road transport*, as amended and adapted to the EEA Agreement by the sectoral adaptations referred to in Annex XIII to that Agreement.

Annex 3 - Reply from the NFSA to the draft report



EFTA Surveillance Authority
Rue Belliard 35
B-1040

Your ref
CNo 72079 ENo 655414

Our ref
11/1337-

Date
22.01.2013

Subject: EFTA Surveillance Authority mission to Norway from 22 to 31 October 2012 regarding application of EEA legislation related to animal welfare during transport and for laying hens on farms - draft report.

Please find enclosed the Norwegian Food Safety Authority's comments to the draft report from above-mentioned mission. Please accept our apologies for the delay.

Yours sincerely,

Bente Odlo
Deputy Director General

Anne Felde Doser
Adviser

This document has been signed electronically and therefore it is not signed by hand

Enclosures: 2

Postal address
PO Box 8007 Dep
0030 Oslo
postmottak@lmd.dep.no

Visiting address
Teatergata 9
www.lmd.dep.no

Telephone
+47 22 24 90 90
Vat no.
972 417 874

Department of Food Policy

Our officer
Anne Felde Doser
+47 22 24 91 39

EFTA Surveillance Authority
Rue de Belliard 35
B-1040 Brussels

Deres ref:
Vår ref: 2012/168100
Dato: 10.01.2013
Org.nr: 985 399 077

Att: Janne Britt Krakhellen

Statens tilsyn for planter, fisk, dyr og næringsmidler



Mattilsynet

EFTA Surveillance Authority mission to Norway from 22 to 31 October 2012 regarding application of EEA legislation related to animal welfare during transport and for laying hens on farms – draft report

The Norwegian Food Safety Authority has some comments on the factual content of the the draft report, please see below.

A plan for corrective measures and actions to be taken, is attached.

Comments on the draft report

5.2 Competent authorities

In the section «Findings» it is described that the NFSA and the NPRA cooperate concerning authorization of transporters and approval of means of transport. This is not correct. We do cooperate concerning the approval of means of transport, but the NPRA is not involved in the process concerning autorisation of transporters.

5.5 Means of transport

In the section "findings" it is described that the NPRA only checks conformity of vehicles for long journeys for bovine, ovine, caprine or porcine species. This is not correct. The NPRA also checks conformity of vehicles for long journeys for horses. In addition, the NPRA are responsible for checking the conformity and give the approval for vehicles used for short journeys for horses (national legislation).

5.6 Checks on transport

In the section "findings" it is described that the Regional office in Nordland had been informed about several long journeys taking place, and that no evidence of further action or follow up could be provided. According to our information, the District Office in Lofoten was informed by officer Vestjord in District Office in Vesterålen about these long transports, and he requested the journey

Mattilsynet
104003 - Seksjon landdyr og
dyrehelsepersonell

Saksbehandler: Hege Bianca Bysheim
Tlf: 22 40 00 00
Besøksadresse: Ullevålsveien 76
E-post: postmottak@mattilsynet.no
(Husk mottakers navn)

www.mattilsynet.no
Postadresse: Postboks 383
Felles postmottak, Postboks 383
2381 Brumunddal
Telefaks: 23 21 68 01

log for each of the transports. It turns out that there are no such journey logs, and the transporter has used vehicles not approved for long journeys for the above mentioned transports. The Regional Office received a copy of the request for journey logs, at a later stage. The transporter has applied for exemption for the requirements concerning equipment in cars intended for long journeys. The application has been declined by the Regional Office. After the mission, the transporter has not carried out any long journeys, and will not do so until the cars are approved for long journeys.

Also under the same section, it is described that the head office of the NFSA stated that there are very few long journeys within Norway; in particular there should be no long journeys for animals for slaughter. This is not correct. The legislation allows long journeys for animals for slaughter at specific circumstances, in the northern part of Norway. These journeys can not, however, exceed 11 hours.

5.8 Fitness of animals

In the section "Findings" it is described that one pig showed severe lameness at the time of departure. This animal was stunned and killed by the driver. The driver did not seem familiar with the procedure and in addition the knife used was blunt. The report says that *this resulted in prolonged suffering* for the animal. We do agree that *this situation represents an increased risk for prolonged suffering* for the animal, because knowledge about the stunning- and killing procedures are essential to secure the animal welfare, and because poor maintenance of the knife could result in poor bleeding/longer bleeding time and a risk for the animal to wake up before it dies a result of the bleeding. In this particular situation, however, there was no signs to indicate that this animal actually did suffer as a consequence of lack of knowledge or poor bleeding. The animal was adequate stunned and did not show any signs of waking up before it died.

Regards



Sofrid Amdal
Head of section

Recommendations and plan of corrective actions, EFTA Surveillance Authority mission to Norway from 22 to 31 October 2012 regarding animal welfare during transport and for laying hens on farms

No	Subject	Recommendations	Action	Time aspect	Enclosures
1	Legislation and implementing measures	The competent authorities should ensure that transports of reindeer that fall within the scope of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, as laid down in Article 1(2) of the Regulation, comply with the prohibition on tying animals by the legs in point 1.11 of Chapter III of Annex I to the Regulation.	Tying animals by the legs is as far as we consider not forbidden for the transports described in article 1 point 2 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, because only articles 3 and 27 applies to these transports. Tying reindeer by the legs is not allowed for other types of transport. Guidance to the public and the regional and district offices to ensure a correct understanding, will be given as soon as possible.	30/03/2013	
2	Legislation and implementing measures	The competent authorities should ensure that no farms with unenriched cages are operating in Norway as required by Article 5(2) of Directive 1999/74/EC.	There are no longer farms in Norway operating with unenriched cages	Completed	
3	Designation of competent authorities and competence of their staff, coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities, enforcement measures	The competent authorities should ensure that all of its staff performing official controls receive appropriate training enabling them to undertake their duties competently and to carry out official controls on transport of live animals and for protection of laying hens in a consistent manner and that they receive regular additional training as necessary as required by Article 6 (a) and (b) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.	NFSA will use the Key skills training activities (Sentrale kompetanseutviklingstiltak) to ensure that our staff receive information and guidance on how to conduct official controls on transport of live animals and protection of laying hens. There is also a electronic training program concerning inspections, which all inspectors in the NFSA must complete. The aim is that inspections shall be carried out in a consistent manner.	2013	
4	Designation of competent authorities and competence of their staff, coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities, enforcement measures	The competent authorities should ensure that adequate official controls at the place of departure or during transport to ensure that the operator remedies the situation are carried out in line with Article 54(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 and Article 26 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	NFSA will get back to this recommendation at a later stage		

5	Designation of competent authorities and competence of their staff, coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities, enforcement measures	The competent authorities should establish rules on penalties applicable to infringements of the provisions of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented; those provisions shall also be notified to the Authority as required by Article 25 of the above mentioned Regulation.	NFSA`s internal guideline on administrative reactions concerning infringements (“Virkemiddelbruk ved tilsyn”), is due to be revised this year, but it might not be accessible for inspectors before early 2014.	spring 2014	
6	Designation of competent authorities and competence of their staff, coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities, enforcement measures	The competent authorities should encourage the development of guides to good practice as laid down in Article 29 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	NFSA will contact cooperative organisations dealing with the livestock industry, such as Animalia (Norwegian Meat and Poultry Research Centre), and encourage them to develop guides to good practice regarding compliance with the requirements in Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	2013	
7	Designation of competent authorities and competence of their staff, coordination and cooperation between and within competent authorities, enforcement measures	The competent authorities should submit to the Authority the annual report for the year 2011 on the inspections of animals, means of transport and accompanying documents as required by Article 27(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and on the inspections of production sites on which certain animals are kept for farming purposes as required by Article 8 of Decision 2006/778.	We are still working on the reports, as explained during the inspection. Solving the mentioned problems has high priority. The reports will be submitted as soon as possible.		
8	Authorisation of transporters	The competent authorities should ensure that companies with roll on roll off vessels are authorised as transporters and that transporters are not operating without a valid transporter authorisation as required by Article 6(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	In Norway we do not consider the companies with roll on roll of vessels to be transporters as described in Article 6 of Regulation 1/2005, and they have therefore not been authorised. In our understanding, the transporters owning the vehicles are responsible for the animals during the journey, including the period at the vessels. As long as these transporters are authorised, we consider the requirement regarding authorised transporters to be fulfilled.		

9	Authorisation of transporters	The competent authorities should ensure that authorisation is granted to transporters only where the applicants have demonstrated that they have appropriate staff, equipment and that they have operational procedures at their disposal to enable them to comply with Article 10(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	We will consider to change the authorisation process in a way that secures that the applicants must declare that they actually do have appropriate staff and equipment, and also must describe their operational procedures in a written formula , to get an authorisation. We will also consider to implement routines that ensures that the district offices carry out inspections to verify the information within a relatively short period of time after the authorisation is given.	2013	
10	Authorisation of transporters	The competent authorities should ensure that changes to the information and documents referred to in Article 10(1) or, for long journeys, in Article 11(1) are notified by the transporters as required by Article 6(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	The authorisation documents for transporters are accompanied by a separate letter describing the decision. We will change the routines to make sure that information regarding the duty to notify to the NFSA any changes in relation to the information and documents referred to in article 10 (1), og for long journeys, Article 11 (1), are properly described in these letters. We will also consider alternative enforcement measures, eg fixed amounts of fines, for such infringements.	2013	
11	Authorisation of transporters	The competent authorities should ensure that contingency plans in the event of emergencies are submitted by the transporters authorised for long journeys as required by Article 11(1)(b)(iv) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	The head office will bring this up as an issue at the regular meetings with the regional offices, to make sure that the routines regarding the authorisation of transporters are improved.	30.30.2013	
12	Means of transport	The competent authorities should ensure that the vehicles carrying out long journeys are approved and have valid certificates of approval as required by Articles 7 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	We will bring this up as an issue at the regular meetings with the regional offices, for them to inform the district offices about the findings and to consider an increased frequency of inspections and suitable enforcement measures to ensure compliance with the legislation.	30/03/2013	

13	Means of transport	The competent authorities should ensure fulfilment of the requirements laid down in Chapter II of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, in particular related to flooring surface minimizing the leakage of urine or faeces (Point 1.1(h), and suitable equipment for loading and unloading (Point 2.2) and in Chapter III of the same Annex related to safety barriers to prevent animals falling escaping during loading and unloading operations (Point 1.4 (b)).	We will bring this up as an issue at the regular meetings with the regional offices, for them to inform the district offices about the findings and to consider an increased frequency of inspections and suitable enforcement measures to ensure compliance with the legislation.	30/03/2013	
14	Checks on transport	The competent authorities should ensure that official controls are carried out at all stages of transport of animals in conformity with the requirements laid down in Articles 15(1) and 27(1) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	This will be taken into consideration, and we will discuss the opportunities to increase the frequency of inspections at other places than place of arrival (both roadside checks and inspections at place of departure). One opportunity to increase the frequency of roadside checks is to do this in cooperation with the NPRA.	2015	
15	Checks on transport	The competent authorities should ensure that their staff is duly trained and equipped to check data recorded by the recording equipment for road transport as provided for by Regulation (EEC) No 3821/85 and the navigation system as required by Article 16 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	This will be taken into consideration, and we will discuss possible solutions together with the NPRA, which is the competent body regarding the recording equipment for road transport in Norway.	2015	
16	Checks on transport	The competent authorities should ensure that all means of transport for ovine animals are cleaned and disinfected immediately after every animal transport as required by Article 8(c)(1)(a) of Directive 91/68/EC.	We will bring this up as an issue at the regular meetings with the regional offices, for them to inform the district offices about the findings and to consider an increased frequency of inspections and suitable enforcement measures to ensure compliance with the legislation.	30/03/2013	
17	Transport documentation	The competent authorities should ensure that the documentation in the means of transport states the expected duration of the intended journey as required by Article 4(e) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	The legislation requires that the documentation include information on the expected duration of the journey. The head office will bring this up as an issue both with the cooperative organisations and with the regional offices, to make sure that the relevant changes in the documents are made and that the district offices focus at this at inspections.	2014	

18	Fitness of animals	The competent authorities should ensure that animals are transported in accordance with the requirements laid down in Articles 3, 6(3) and 8(1) as well as Chapter I of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.	We will bring this up as an issue at the regular meetings with the regional offices, for them to inform the district offices about the findings and to consider an increased frequency of inspections and suitable enforcement measures to ensure compliance with the legislation.	30/03/2013	
19	Fitness of animals	The competent authorities should ensure that injured/diseased animals are transported to the slaughterhouse only when authorised by the competent authority of the place of departure as required by Article 12 of Council Directive 93/119/EC.	We will bring this up as an issue at the regular meetings with the regional offices, for them to inform the district offices about the findings and to consider an increased frequency of inspections and suitable enforcement measures to ensure compliance with the legislation.	30/03/2013	
20	Transport practices	The competent authorities should ensure that transport practices are in conformity with the requirements set down in Point 1.12(d) and (e) of Chapter III of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 concerning separation of sexually mature males from females and animals with horns from animals without horns.	We will bring this up as an issue at the regular meetings with the regional offices, for them to inform the district offices about the findings and to consider an increased frequency of inspections and suitable enforcement measures to ensure compliance with the legislation.	30/03/2013	
21	Assembly centres, Control posts and Livestock centres	The competent authorities should ensure that, when the total amount of journey time exceed the eight hours, the relevant requirements related to long journeys as set out in Articles 11, 15 and 18 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, as well as Chapter VI of Annex I to the Regulation are complied with.	The head office is currently working on drawing up a letter to the regional offices, both to clarify the requirements and to give instructions regarding the follow up at these premises. This issue will also be brought up at contact meetings with the cooperative organisations.	2013	
22	Assembly centres, Control posts and Livestock centres	The competent authorities should ensure that assembly centres comply with the requirements of Points 8 and 9 of the Annex to Council Directive 98/58/EC in particular with respect to the materials used for the construction of accommodation which were not capable of being thoroughly cleaned and disinfected and not constructed to prevent injury to the animals.	There is no assembly centres approved for intra-EEA trade. Directive 98/58/EC is only applicable for intra-EEA trade. As mentioned in the point above (21), we will inform the regional offices about the requirements that must be fulfilled to get approval, and also that non-approved assembly centres can not be considered as place of departure.	2013	

23	Laying hen farms	The competent authorities should ensure that inspections to monitor compliance with the provisions of Directive 1999/74/EC are carried out in accordance with Article 8 of the same Directive.	See point 25 (below). In connection with the changes in the database we will instruct the regional offices to make sure that the relevant measurements are carried out, and that the information registered at the holdings in MATS are updated.	2014	
24	Laying hen farms	The competent authorities should ensure that appropriate perches providing at least 15 cm per hen are always accessible as required by Article 6(1)(d) of Directive 1999/74/EC.	The head office will make the necessary changes in MATS to make sure that the district offices focus at the access for hens to appropriate perches. This include making a seperate check point regarding perches, and to make this obligatory.	30/03/2013	
25	Laying hen farms	The competent authorities should ensure that the information on the establishment concerning maximum capacity corresponds to Point 1 of the Annex to Directive 2002/4/EC and that the distinguishing number is composed of a digit indicating the farming method in accordance with point 2.1 followed by the code of the Member State according to point 2.2 of the above mentioned Annex.	NFSA will update the information regarding maximum capacity on laying hens farms, and we will consider changes in the database to be able to allocate distinguishing number in accordance with point 2.1 of the Annex to Directive 2002/4/EC	2014	