



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 19/12/2006
COM(2006) 838 final

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL

**on the experience acquired on the implementation of Directive 98/58/EC on the
protection of animals kept for farming purposes**

REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL

on the experience acquired on the implementation of Directive 98/58/EC on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes

(Text with EEA relevance)

1. BACKGROUND

The proper enforcement of Community legislation in the field of animal welfare represents a priority for the EU citizens. In the last 25 years the EU has developed a substantial set of legislation on the protection of farmed animals and Member States are primarily responsible for its implementation.

The Commission has emphasized the need for securing efficient enforcement of existing EU legislation in this field. Indeed, this report is part of the key actions for 2006 by the Community Action Plan on the Protection and Welfare of Animals¹ which stresses the need for a better implementation.

Directive 98/58/EC² on the protection of animals kept for farming purposes provides for general animal welfare requirements which derives from the approval by the Community³ of the European Convention for the protection of animals kept for farming purposes (Council of Europe Convention). This Convention contains subsequent recommendations on many animals' categories that Member States are due to implement. In addition the EU legislation on the protection of farm animals is further detailed by specific directives on laying hens (Directive 1999/74/EC⁴), calves (Directive 91/629/EEC⁵) and pigs (Directive 91/630/EEC⁶).

Article 5(2) of Directive 98/58/EC requires for the Commission to submit a report to the Council on the experience acquired by the Member States since the implementation of the Directive, if appropriate accompanied by proposals. Before submitting any proposal to the Council, the Commission thinks that a more accurate picture of situation needs to be established, in particular through the improvement of the reporting system of the Member States.

This report will review the level of implementation by the Member States of the above-mentioned Community legislation and inform the Council of a Commission Decision which will replace Commission Decision 2000/50/EC⁷ concerning the

¹ COM(2006)13 and COM(2006)14.

² OJ L 221, 8.8.1998, p. 23.

³ Decision 78/923/EEC (OJ L 323, 17.11.1978, p. 12).

⁴ OJ L 203, 3.8.1999, p. 53.

⁵ OJ L 340, 11.12.1991, p. 28. Directive as last amended by Commission Decision 97/182/EC (OJ L 76, 18.3.1997, p. 30).

⁶ OJ L 340, 11.12.1991, p. 33. Directive as last amended by Commission Directive 2001/93/EC (OJ L 316, 1.12.2001, p. 36).

⁷ OJ L 19, 25.1.2000, p. 51.

minimum requirements for the inspection of holdings on which animals are kept for farming purposes.

The experience acquired by the Commission on the enforcement of Decision 2000/50/EC indicated that it was necessary to:

- improve the transparency of the results of inspections carried out by the Member States in this field and,
- adapt this instrument to the new approach to food chain monitoring introduced by Regulation (EC) No 882/2004⁸ on official controls of the food chain.

Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 foresees that Member States shall implement control plans and annual reports indicating the results of inspections conducted in several fields related to food safety including animal welfare. The regulation took effect on 1 January 2006.

Furthermore since 2003, the reform of the Common Agriculture Policy has introduced the concept of cross-compliance. In this framework direct payments to farmers will be granted only if compliance is met with certain animal welfare rules⁹. This condition will apply, as far as animal welfare rules are concerned, from 1 January 2007. In this context there is an additional motivation for the Commission to anticipate the development of tools for evaluating enforcement of EU animal welfare rules on farm animals.

2. MAIN FINDINGS

2.1 Sources of information

Today in each Member State, animal welfare inspections are performed in the field and the findings reported to the central competent authority, which in turn, sent the data to the Commission. These data constitute the Member States' reports required by Decision 2000/50/EC (see Table 4 to 9 of the annex). In addition this report is also based on the inspection reports of experts from the Commission. Those experts are in charge of checking the proper enforcement of Community legislation in this field (see Tables 2 and 3 of the annex).

2.2 Transposition of EU legislation, guidance and training of officials

Today transposition of the EU legislation in national laws is satisfactory in most of the Member States visited by the experts from the Commission. The reality of the transposition of the EU legislation is however quite mixed. Some Member States have implemented welfare standards that go beyond Community standards while other Member States have delayed the application.

⁸ Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules (OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1).

⁹ Regulation (EC) No 1782/2003 (OJ L 270, 21.10.2003, p. 1).

In addition in certain cases, the experts from the Commission identified that in certain Member States insufficient training or guidance of the official inspectors was the biggest factor resulting in unsatisfactory inspections.

2.3 Improvements still needed for planning and performing inspections

From 2000 to 2003 the experts from the Commission found that few competent authorities set up specific national programmes that could provide a satisfactory level of monitoring and enforcement. However from 2004 to 2005 progress has been achieved in many Member States to address this deficiency.

Checks were often made on the farm for other purposes (i.e. for example animal health programs, residue checks). The integrated approach for inspecting farms presents many advantages, provided that all the aspects to be inspected are planned and performed with equal efficiency. However, in many instances, animal welfare was left to local initiatives while other programs get much higher priorities.

This situation has lead in some cases to perform animal welfare inspections in a rather superficial way. This problem has been partially corrected by a number of competent authorities who have developed more detailed checklists on animal welfare.

There is also a recent improvement in some Member States concerning the selection of farms to be inspected. It seems to derive from the progressive implementation of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 as well as the increasing awareness of the authorities of the immanent link between the compliance with welfare requirements and the granting of direct payments (Regulation on cross-compliance).

However there is still progress to be achieved where inspections on animal welfare are not performed in any meaningful detail.

2.4 Recording and reporting system: mixed results

The data available today to the Commission demonstrate that details of inspections and subsequent actions were not systematically recorded in some Member States with sometimes no proper reporting system in place.

On the other hand, some Member States have developed electronic reporting systems that allow quick and accurate consolidation of data.

Experience shows that the use of proper checklists that includes all the requirements of Directive 98/58/EC is essential to cover all the welfare aspects of a holding. Although progress has been achieved recently in some Member States, there are still too many cases where checklists are limited to the species specific legislative requirements or sometimes even missing. This fact limits the importance of the information collected.

In addition, to obtain a proper picture of the situation at national and EU level data on inspection should be collected under harmonised categories as the ones

provided by Decision 2000/50/EC. The experts from the Commission reported that checklist design do not always ensure that all the criteria were inspected.

2.5 Major difficulties in obtaining and interpreting the data from Member States (Tables 4 to 9 of the annex)

For period 2000-2001 only three Member States sent satisfactory reports on time (i.e. before 30 April 2002) and only one for the 2002-2003 period. For both periods the Commission had to remind the Member States of their reporting obligations either because no report was provided or not under the appropriate format or because the data presented major inconsistencies (see Table 1 of the annex).

Member States data are difficult to interpret for two reasons:

- (a) Inconsistency of the data provided by the same Member States;
- (b) Likelihood of very different methodologies in collecting data between the Member States.

The Commission tends to conclude that differences in data between Member States may be more due to differences in the way the number of inspections is calculated rather than the actual performance.

2.6 Technical findings from Member States reports

The infringements reported by Member States were mostly related to four categories defined by Commission decision 2000/50/EC: buildings, freedom of movements, record keeping and inspection.

As regards the category "*buildings*", the definition includes improper design of the buildings and equipments as well as inadequate use of the facilities such as ventilation or lighting programs. Pigs farms are more frequently mentioned in this category of infringements than other species.

The category "*freedom of movements*" includes overcrowding of animals. This category of infringement is reported equally for all species (calves, pigs and laying hens).

The categories "*inspection*" and "*record keeping*" relates respectively to the improper examination of the animals and the insufficient traceability of the medical treatments and mortalities observed by the farmer.

Officials of the Commission regularly carry out on-the-spot visits as to stimulate the efforts of the Member States for better rate of compliance. Furthermore since the entry into force of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004¹⁰, Member States need to adjust their national control plan as to take into account the results of their official controls as well as the one carried out by the Community.

¹⁰

1 January 2006.

3. COMMISSION DECISION 2006/778/EC¹¹

From the above, it appears that although Member States carry out controls on animal welfare, the reporting lacked consistency and transparency. As a consequence the data available to the Commission are of little use in order to improve the situation, in particular to support the initiatives foreseen in the Community Action Plan for the Protection and Welfare of Animals.

As a consequence, the Commission adopted a Decision as to improve the reporting system of the Member States. This decision, which will apply from 1 January 2008, addresses a number of issues identified in this report.

It will contribute to harmonise the methodology for the reporting by Member States on the results of their inspections. It will also help the Member States to better manage their resources and improve the visibility of their action to the general public.

Furthermore it will facilitate the work of the Commission in evaluating the respect of the EU legislation and contribute in the decision making process, in particular allowing an impact assessment of the future policies. This is the case for animals' categories covered by recommendations of the European Convention for the Protection of Animals Kept for Farming Purposes.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

However the Commission believes that the present mandate¹² given by the Council for implementing Directive 98/58/EC can not address all issues raised here and further initiatives are necessary.

First there is a concern expressed by certain competent authorities over excessive bureaucracy. The Commission is also of the opinion that procedures need to be simplified as to privilege actions over paperwork. At the same time, citizens ask for more transparency and communication on the actions carried out by their public administration.

Secondly there is an increasing integration of animal welfare issues within other Community policies and in particular within the Common Agriculture Policy (organic farming, rural development, cross-compliance) and the Research Policy. This implies that the developing an accurate reporting system at Community level will not only serve animal welfare objectives but also will contribute in the evaluation of other EU policies and to better address future research needs.

Thirdly it is necessary for competent authorities to improve the level of awareness and technical know-how of their officials in charge of checking animal welfare requirements in farms.

¹¹ OJ L 314, 15.11.2006, p. 39.

¹² Comitology procedure is mainly limited to the reporting obligations of the Member States (Article 6(3) of Directive 98/58/EC).

To address those issues the Community is studying the possibility to:

- make Member States reports on animal welfare inspections publicly available through internet, subject to the conditions laid down in Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001¹³ regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents;
- Realise a feasibility study on the development of a software application assisting the Member States in collecting information related to animal welfare inspections at farms;
- Develop a more comprehensive training policy for Member States officials responsible for inspections on animal welfare at farm.

¹³ OJ L 145, 31.5.2001, p. 43.

ANNEX

TABLE 1 – LEVEL OF COMPLIANCE¹⁴ OF THE MEMBER STATES' REPORTS

Type of compliance/ non compliance	2000-2001 reports	2002-2003 reports
Full compliance	DE, FI, LU	DE
In compliance but not on time	BE, FR, IE, UK	AT, BE, FI, IE, UK
In compliance after reminder	AT, DK, IT, NL, SE	DK, ES, FR, IT, SE, LU, NL
Not in compliance	ES, EL, PT	EL, PT

¹⁴ Compliance with Decision 2000/50/EC concerning the minimum requirements for the inspection of holdings on which animals are kept for farming purposes.

**TABLE 2 - LIST OF INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT BY EXPERTS FROM THE COMMISSION
2000-2003**

Member States	Dates	Reference	Scope		
			Pigs	Calves	Laying hens
AT Austria	June 2000	DG SANCO 1099/2000	x	x	
	May 2000	DG SANCO 1009/2000*			x
BE Belgium	September 2000	DG SANCO 1103/2000	x	x	
	May 1999 / Jan. 2000	DG SANCO 1012/2000*			x
DE Germany	November 2001	DG SANCO 3382/2001	x	x	x
	March 2000	DG SANCO 1057/2000*			x
DK Denmark	May 2000	DG SANCO 1098/2000	x	x	
ES Spain	September 2001	DG SANCO 3344/2001	x	x	x
EL Greece	June 2002	DG SANCO 8522/2002	x	x	x
	March 2000	DG SANCO 1133/2000*			x
FR France	October 2000	DG SANCO 1263/2000	x	x	
FI Finland	June 2001	DG SANCO 3312/2001	x	x	x
	June 2000	DG SANCO 1160/2000*			x
IT Italy	October 2001	DG SANCO 3385/2001	x	x	x
IE Ireland	October 2001	DG SANCO 3383/2001	x	x	x
LU Luxembourg	November 2001	DG SANCO 3343/2001	x	x	x
	January 2000	DG SANCO 1013/2000*			x
PT Portugal	May 2000	DG SANCO 1158/2000*			x
SE Sweden	March 2000	DG SANCO 1101/2000	x	x	
	April 2000	DG SANCO 1135/2000*			x
UK United Kingdom	March 2000	DG SANCO 1102/2000	x	x	
TOTAL		21	13	13	15

* Missions on poultry meat that include a section on the welfare of laying hens

**TABLE 3 - LIST OF INSPECTION CARRIED OUT BY EXPERTS FROM THE COMMISSION
2004-2005**

Member States	Dates	Reference	Scope		
			Pigs	Calves	Laying hens
DE Germany	March 2004	DG(SANCO)7018/2004			x
DK Denmark	January 2004	DG(SANCO) 7208/2004			x
EE Estonia	September 2005	DG(SANCO)7714/2005	x		
ES Spain	February 2004	DG(SANCO)7230/2004			x
	February/March 2005	DG(SANCO)7548/2005	x		
FR France	March 2004	DG(SANCO)7231/2004			x
IT Italy	May 2004	DG(SANCO)7010/2004			x
	May 2005	DG(SANCO)7636/2005	x		
LV Latvia	May/June 2005	DG(SANCO)7637/2005	x		
NL Netherlands	January- February 2005	DG(SANCO)7512/2005	x		
PT Portugal	February 2005	DG(SANCO)7544/2005	x		
PL Poland	June/July 2005	DG(SANCO)7638/2005	x		
UK United Kingdom	January 2004	DG(SANCO)7019/2004			x
TOTAL		13	7	0	6

TABLE 4 – MEMBER STATES REPORTS ON LAYING HENS (2000-2001)

LAYING HENS 2000+2001	(a) Number of holdings ⁽¹⁾	(b) Number of inspections ⁽²⁾	% inspection (b/a)	(c) Number of infringements per technical area									(d) Total number Infringements	% infringements (d/b)
				Staff	Inspection	Record keeping	Freedom of movement	Buildings	Equipment	Feeding and other substances	Mutilations	Breeding procedures		
AU Austria	26.588	1.184	4,45%	9	48	99	36	15	13	9	10	9	248	20,95%
BE Belgium	470	333	70,85%	4	21	19	10	6	49	0	0	0	109	32,73%
DE Germany	36.798	5.814	15,80%	64	169	353	173	176	85	22	30	0	1.072	18,44%
DK Denmark	78	253	324,36%	0	9	0	33	2	1	0	0	0	45	17,79%
ES Spain	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
EL Greece	179	170	94,97%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
FR France	229.073	225	0,10%	0	6	7	19	2	2	4	0	0	40	17,78%
FI Finland	1.053	65	6,17%	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	4,62%
IT Italy	1.538	1.516	98,57%	0	5	7	7	7	8	1	0	3	38	2,51%
IE Ireland	117	76	64,96%	0	0	0	7	5	4	0	0	0	16	21,05%
LU Luxembourg	741	2.962	399,73%	0	5	5	2	2	1	0	0	0	15	0,51%
NL Netherlands	1.500	133	8,87%	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	6,02%
PT Portugal	NA	41	-	1	4	4	12	24	21	0	0	0	66	160,98%
SE Sweden	6.100	895	14,67%	23	29	8	33	65	19	1	5	6	189	21,12%
UK United Kingdom	27.537	335	1,22%	16	11	6	26	26	27	0	2	0	114	34,03%
TOTAL EU	331.772	14.002	4,22%	117	309	509	366	330	230	37	47	18	1.963	14,02%
Percentage of infringement per inspection				0,84%	2,21%	3,64%	2,61%	2,36%	1,64%	0,26%	0,34%	0,13%		

(1) the number of holdings is an average within the period

(2) total number of inspections declared for the period

NA non available

TABLE 5 – MEMBER STATES REPORTS ON LAYING HENS (2002-2003)

LAYING HENS 2002+2003	(a) Number of holdings ⁽¹⁾	(b) Number of inspections ⁽²⁾	% inspection (b/a)	(c) Number of infringements per technical area									(d) Total number Infringements	% infringements (d/b)
				Staff	Inspection	Record keeping	Freedom of movement	Buildings	Equipment	Feeding and other substances	Mutilations	Breeding procedures		
AT Austria	52.821	1.543	2,92%	760	870	840	809	775	700	767	759	760	7.040	456,25%
BE Belgium	429	388	90,44%	13	18	13	14	12	9	2	6	0	87	22,42%
DE Germany	40.529	6.452	15,92%	117	356	458	298	391	150	100	116	31	2.017	31,26%
DK Denmark	318	240	75,47%	0	8	3	13	51	20	0	0	0	95	39,58%
ES Spain	2.051	405	19,75%	0	32	43	64	6	37	4	8	9	203	50,12%
EL Greece	201	133	66,17%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,00%
FR France	2.357	846	35,89%	9	73	65	0	22	38	0	24	0	231	27,30%
FI Finland	902	136	15,08%	0	1	3	6	4	1	2	0	0	17	12,50%
IT Italy	1.172	1.836	156,72%	0	3	14	4	6	4	0	0	0	31	1,69%
IE Ireland	237	46	19,41%	0	2	1	6	16	7	0	0	0	32	69,57%
LU Luxembourg	16	62	400,00%	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	6,45%
NL Netherlands	1.350	27	2,00%	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7,41%
PT Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SE Sweden	5.373	1.626	30,27%	4	15	1	26	47	10	0	0	1	104	6,40%
UK United Kingdom	31.282	515	1,65%	25	30	23	50	44	40	29	25	0	266	51,65%
TOTAL EU	139.036	14.255	10,25%	928	1.420	1.467	1.290	1.374	1.017	904	938	801	10.129	71,06%
Percentage of infringement per inspection				0,97%	1,48%	1,54%	1,35%	1,44%	1,07%	0,95%	0,98%	0,84%		

(1) the number of holdings is an average within the period

(2) total number of inspections declared for the period

NA non available

TABLE 6 – MEMBER STATES REPORTS ON CALVES (2000-2001)

CALVES 2000+2001	(a) Number of holdings ⁽¹⁾	(b) Number of inspections ⁽²⁾	% inspection (b/a)	(c) Number of infringements per technical area									(d) Total number Infringements	% infringements (d/b)
				Staff	Inspection	Record keeping	Freedom of movement	Buildings	Equipment	Feeding and other substances	Mutilations	Breeding procedures		
AU Austria	80.477	8.701	10,81%	29	104	171	264	53	30	40	45	28	764	8,78%
BE Belgium	393	199	50,64%	9	1	2	8	3	0	0	0	0	23	11,56%
DE Germany	156.491	28.931	18,49%	289	813	1.076	1.306	954	137	163	76	0	4.814	16,64%
DK Denmark	37.100	845	2,28%	0	2	64	94	13	17	0	3	0	193	22,84%
ES Spain	NA	NA	-	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
EL Greece	3.707	3.181	85,81%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
FR France	236.533	163	0,07%	0	11	7	5	82	45	27	0	0	177	108,59%
FI Finland	27.388	917	3,35%	0	8	0	178	37	0	3	0	0	226	24,65%
IT Italy	31.327	22.177	70,79%	0	8	108	13	6	9	0	5	1	150	0,68%
IE Ireland	79.084	1.067	1,35%	0	2	5	6	24	0	0	0	0	37	3,47%
LU Luxembourg	1.843	7.372	400,00%	8	12	262	0	8	0	0	0	0	290	3,93%
NL Netherlands	2.400	3.090	128,75%	0	0	82	0	0	5	4	5	0	96	3,11%
PT Portugal	NA	49	-	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	12	24,49%
SE Sweden	28.500	9.106	31,95%	186	422	76	329	709	225	48	74	106	2.175	23,89%
UK United Kingdom	102.899	867	0,84%	79	47	80	26	104	18	0	9	5	368	42,45%
TOTAL EU	788.142	86.665	11,00%	600	1.430	1.933	2.229	2.005	486	285	217	140	9.325	10,76%
Percentage of infringement per inspection				0,69%	1,65%	2,23%	2,57%	2,31%	0,56%	0,33%	0,25%	0,16%		

(1) the number of holdings is an average within the period

(2) total number of inspections declared for the period

NA non available

TABLE 7 – MEMBER STATES REPORTS ON CALVES (2002-2003)

CALVES 2002+2003	(a) Number of holdings ⁽¹⁾	(b) Number of inspections ⁽²⁾	% inspection (b/a)	(c) Number of infringements per technical area									(d) Total number Infringements	% infringements (d/b)
				Staff	Inspection	Record keeping	Freedom of movement	Buildings	Equipment	Feeding and other substances	Mutilations	Breeding procedures		
AT Austria	62.422	9.378	15,02%	2.968	3.006	3.065	3.025	2.943	2.951	2.923	2.944	2.922	26.747	285,21%
BE Belgium	184	175	95,11%	7	10	7	8	9	7	7	7	0	62	35,43%
DE Germany	160.601	31.021	19,32%	426	1.757	1.852	2.160	1.711	144	252	219	25	8.546	27,55%
DK Denmark	34.360	1.086	3,16%	0	5	73	80	13	3	0	8	0	182	16,76%
ES Spain	35.309	5.218	14,78%	4	104	349	145	111	67	72	60	66	978	18,74%
EL Greece	1.833	1.112	60,67%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0,09%
FR France	24.500	503	2,05%	0	81	49	1	71	189	0	0	0	391	77,73%
FI Finland	25.178	890	3,53%	1	23	39	307	105	0	35	0	0	510	57,30%
IT Italy	43.394	22.308	51,41%	4	52	13	20	63	17	3	13	6	191	0,86%
IE Ireland	75.823	1.049	1,38%	12	11	1	9	29	0	0	0	1	63	6,01%
LU Luxembourg	1.621	6.484	400,00%	38	27	158	15	31	0	1	0	16	286	4,41%
NL Netherlands	39.000	4.380	11,23%	0	182	380	14	3	21	8	2	0	610	13,93%
PT Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SE Sweden	25.021	10.987	43,91%	113	327	29	153	682	124	1	2	24	1.455	13,24%
UK United Kingdom	67.455	836	1,24%	64	32	54	65	91	55	12	49	5	427	51,08%
TOTAL EU	596.700	95.427	15,99%	3.637	5.617	6.069	6.002	5.863	3.578	3.314	3.304	3.065	40.449	42,39%
Percentage of infringement per inspection				3,81%	5,89%	6,36%	6,29%	6,14%	3,75%	3,47%	3,46%	3,21%		

(1) the number of holdings is an average within the period

(2) total number of inspections declared for the period

NA non available

TABLE 8 – MEMBER STATES REPORTS ON PIGS (2000-2001)

PIGS 2000+2001	(a) Number of holdings ⁽¹⁾	(b) Number of inspections ⁽²⁾	% inspection (b/a)	(c) Number of infringements per technical area									(d) Total number Infringements	% infringements (d/b)
				Staff	Inspection	Record keeping	Freedom of movement	Buildings	Equipment	Feeding and other substances	Mutilations	Breeding procedures		
AU Austria	59.395	3.430	5,77%	3	57	861	71	33	21	11	15	3	1.075	31,34%
BE Belgium	12.465	4.510	36,18%	61	83	384	77	691	50	27	66	0	1.439	31,91%
DE Germany	146.529	25.848	17,64%	148	1.253	1.687	813	1.465	430	115	82	1	5.994	23,19%
DK Denmark	21.750	366	1,68%	1	34	80	42	5	43	0	32	0	237	64,75%
ES Spain	NA	NA	NA	-	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
EL Greece	860	628	73,02%	-	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	-
FR France	59.549	168	0,28%	0	14	42	2	32	18	7	1	6	122	72,62%
FI Finland	4.386	140	3,19%	0	1	0	1	1	0	6	1	0	10	7,14%
IT Italy	16.368	10.026	61,25%	1	8	24	18	29	46	2	0	7	135	1,35%
IE Ireland	554	230	41,52%	0	8	0	6	29	52	0	0	0	95	41,30%
LU Luxembourg	322	1.288	400,00%	0	12	54	3	5	2	0	0	0	76	5,90%
NL Netherlands	14.000	4.134	29,53%	0	41	3	179	0	218	0	1	0	442	10,69%
PT Portugal	NA	373	-	6	126	2	19	178	302	0	0	0	633	169,71%
SE Sweden	5.750	1.903	33,10%	54	111	15	40	154	58	9	32	25	498	26,17%
UK United Kingdom	11.121	1.139	10,24%	88	68	55	39	195	50	0	8	18	521	45,74%
TOTAL EU	353.049	54.183	15,35%	362	1.816	3.207	1.310	2.817	1.290	177	238	60	11.277	20,81%
Percentage of infringement per inspection				0,67%	3,35%	5,92%	2,42%	5,20%	2,38%	0,33%	0,44%	0,11%		

(1) the number of holdings is an average within the period

(2) total number of inspections declared for the period

NA non available

TABLE 9 – MEMBER STATES REPORTS ON PIGS (2002-2003)

PIGS 2002+2003	(a) Number of holdings ⁽¹⁾	(b) Number of inspections ⁽²⁾	% inspection (b/a)	(c) Number of infringements per technical area									(d) Total number Infringements	% infringements (d/b)
				Staff	Inspection	Record keeping	Freedom of movement	Buildings	Equipment	Feeding and other substances	Mutilations	Breeding procedures		
AT Austria	55.958	2.625	4,69%	1.314	1.351	1.435	1.363	1.339	1.379	1.316	1.333	1.314	12.144	462,63%
BE Belgium	10.814	2.294	21,21%	28	146	38	29	406	43	0	83	0	773	33,70%
DE Germany	141.120	33.014	23,39%	372	1.903	2.596	832	2.162	567	367	326	218	9.343	28,30%
DK Denmark	20.175	526	2,61%	0	37	162	26	9	61	0	72	0	367	69,77%
ES Spain	95.840	2.978	3,11%	10	46	281	91	40	117	13	164	143	905	30,39%
EL Greece	600	403	67,22%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0,00%
FR France	59.549	942	1,58%	0	144	175	16	209	75	0	221	0	840	89,17%
FI Finland	3.716	139	3,74%	0	2	0	7	12	0	9	0	0	30	21,58%
IT Italy	26.569	10.868	40,91%	2	7	17	7	49	53	5	0	2	142	1,31%
IE Ireland	1.192	212	17,79%	1	4	3	31	73	11	0	0	0	123	58,02%
LU Luxembourg	321	1.284	400,00%	2	31	53	0	24	12	0	6	6	134	10,44%
NL Netherlands	11.000	1.330	12,09%	0	28	0	40	3	109	0	0	0	180	13,53%
PT Portugal	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
SE Sweden	3.834	2.854	74,45%	12	57	7	14	121	32	0	5	1	249	8,72%
UK United Kingdom	10.353	1.198	11,57%	160	59	99	176	202	98	40	120	34	988	82,47%
TOTAL EU	441.038	60.667	13,76%	1.901	3.815	4.866	2.632	4.649	2.557	1.750	2.330	1.718	26.218	13,22%
Percentage of infringement per inspection				1,99%	4,00%	5,10%	2,76%	4,87%	2,68%	1,83%	2,44%	1,80%		

(1) the number of holdings is an average within the period

(2) total number of inspections declared for the period

NA non available