



\* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese
- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

\* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business organisation
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)

- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

\* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

\* Scope

- International
- Local
- National
- Regional

\* Level of governance

- Parliament
- Authority
- Agency

\* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

- |                                      |  |                                     |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan    | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti           | <input type="radio"/> Libya         | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands  | <input type="radio"/> Dominica           | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon        |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania        | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania     | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria        | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador            | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg    | <input type="radio"/> Samoa                            |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt              | <input type="radio"/> Macau         | <input type="radio"/> San Marino                       |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra        | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador        | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar    | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe            |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola         | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea  | <input type="radio"/> Malawi        | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia                     |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla       | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea            | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia      | <input type="radio"/> Senegal                          |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica     | <input type="radio"/> Estonia            | <input type="radio"/> Maldives      | <input type="radio"/> Serbia                           |

- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
  
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan
  
- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands
  
- Eswatini
- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
  
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
  
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
  
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana
  
- Mali
- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova
  
- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma
  
- Namibia
- Nauru
  
- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger
  
- Seychelles
- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland
  
- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia

- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Turkey
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen

- Czechia
- Lebanon
- Saint Helena  
Ascension and  
Tristan da Cunha
- Zambia
- Democratic  
Republic of the  
Congo
- Lesotho
- Saint Kitts and  
Nevis
- Zimbabwe
- Denmark
- Liberia
- Saint Lucia

**\* Organisation name**

*255 character(s) maximum*

Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuur en Voedselkwaliteit

**Transparency register number**

*255 character(s) maximum*

Check if your organisation is on the [transparency register](#). It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, 'business association, 'consumer association', 'EU citizen') country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

**\* Contribution publication privacy settings**

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

**Anonymous**

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

## Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

---

### **Fitness check and revision of current legislation:**

In 2020, the European Commission adopted its [Farm to Fork Strategy](#) (F2F), to promote a shift towards a [sustainable food system](#).

Because animal welfare is a cornerstone of sustainable food production, Farm to Fork committed the Commission to revising the current EU animal welfare legislation by 2023, and to consider options for animal welfare labelling.

The purpose is to improve animal welfare and broaden the scope of the legislation, by aligning it with the latest scientific evidence, current political priorities and public expectations – all while making the legislation easier to enforce.

The EU legislation under review is:

- a [Directive concerning the protection of animals kept for farming purposes](#)
- 4 Directives laying down minimum standards for protecting:
  - [laying hens](#)
  - [broilers](#)
  - [pigs](#)
  - [calves](#)
- a [Regulation on animal transport](#)
- a [Regulation on the protection of animals at the time of killing](#).

These EU acts regulate animal welfare at farm level, during transport and at slaughter, and cover animals – including fish – that are bred and kept for farming purposes, as well as cats and dogs that are transported for commercial purposes.

The acts do not cover wild animals (except when they are killed for the purpose of depopulation), experimental or laboratory animals (except when they are being transported) or any invertebrate animals.

The goal is to improve the welfare of animals while ensuring sustainable production and fair competition for EU businesses in the single market.

In 2020 the Commission performed an evaluation ('fitness check') of the existing legislation, to assess what needed to be changed, followed in 2021 by the start of an impact assessment for the possible changes.

This consultation would like to know your views on the existing animal welfare rules, as well the changes we are suggesting.

### 1. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know
* Compared to 25 years ago, there is more uniform protection of farmed animals across EU countries	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Compared to 25 years ago, more comprehensive protection of farmed animals (in terms of species protected) has been reached across the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Requirements set by EU rules on animal welfare are easy to apply and it is clear how they should be applied	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Increased animal welfare has contributed to a more sustainable food system, for instance by allowing for healthier animals to enter the food chain	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Having common rules on animal welfare has facilitated trade and improved competition in Europe – for instance by removing obstacles to trading animals and products of animal origin in the single market	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### 2. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know
* Abiding by (certain) animal welfare requirements set in EU rules is not (too) burdensome and/or costly for producers (e.g. farmers)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Abiding by (certain) animal welfare requirements set in EU rules is not (too) burdensome and/or costly for processors (e.g. slaughterhouses)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>



* Abiding by (certain) animal welfare requirements set in EU rules is not (too) burdensome and/or costly for retailers	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Abiding by (certain) animal welfare requirements set in EU rules is not disproportionately burdensome and/or costly for small/medium businesses (e.g. slaughterhouses, transport companies, retailers)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Rules and requirements on animal welfare are not (too) complex for consumers to understand	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* EU rules and requirements on animal welfare impose extra costs on consumers when buying animal welfare-compliant products	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### 3. Level of information on animal welfare standards in the EU

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know
* I feel sufficiently informed about the conditions under which animals are farmed in the EU (i.e. how they are treated during the breeding period)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* I feel sufficiently informed about the conditions under which farmed animals are transported in the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* I feel sufficiently informed about the conditions under which farmed animals are transported beyond EU borders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* I feel sufficiently informed about the conditions under which farmed animals are slaughtered in the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

#### Possible changes to EU animal welfare legislation:

#### 4. Is the current level of animal welfare in the EU sufficient to:

\* - Ensure adequate and uniform protection of all animal species in need?

- Yes  
 No  
 Do not know

\* - Ensure that businesses can compete fairly across the EU?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

\* - Meet future challenges in relation to sustainable food production, such as climate change and biodiversity loss?

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

If you have replied NO to any of the questions above, which of the actions listed below could help improve animal welfare in the EU?

	Very important	Important	Moderately important
More inspections and controls by national authorities to improve compliance with existing rules	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improve existing rules on welfare requirements for pigs, calves, laying hens and broilers	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cover additional animal species, alongside the ones that are already protected by specific legislation (pigs, calves, laying hens and broilers)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase the use of modern technology to better monitor the welfare of animals during transport (e.g. cameras, satellite navigation systems, artificial intelligence)?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Increase the use of scientific indicators, to better assess the welfare of animals (e.g. injury rates other than foot-pad dermatitis)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Improve training for people handling animals, so they are able to adopt practices that improve welfare (e.g. for farmers, slaughterhouse staff and drivers)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Provide better information to consumers on animal welfare conditions	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Animal welfare during transport:**

Current EU legislation in this field regulates the transport of live animals between EU countries and requires checks on animals entering or leaving the EU.

To prevent injury and/or unnecessary suffering, all animals transported must be fit to travel, sufficient height and floor space must be available, and water, feed and rest must be provided when needed and within

certain intervals.

For long journeys (i.e. over 8 hours) between EU countries and to destinations outside the EU, transporters must have the necessary authorisation(s), documentation, satellite navigation system and contingency plans for emergencies. National authorities must carry out checks at the point of departure and on a random basis thereafter.

### 5. To (better) protect animals during long journeys (over 8 hours):

	Yes	No	Do not know
* Maximum journey times should be introduced	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* More specific requirements for different animal species are needed	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Technical requirements are needed for the different means of transport used for long journeys (e.g. satellite monitoring, ventilation and water supply)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### 6. Given the difficulties ensuring compliance with the rules beyond EU borders:

	Yes	No	Do not know
* Exports of live animals to non-EU countries for breeding should be prohibited (after a transition period)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Export of live animals to non-EU countries for slaughter should be prohibited (after a transition period)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Exports of live animals should be limited only to non-EU countries whose requirements on animal welfare are at least equivalent to those in the EU	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Exports of live animals to non-EU countries should be allowed only under stricter control conditions (e.g. at departure, at any stage of a long journey and at EU exit points)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

### 7. To improve welfare for unweaned calves and other vulnerable animals, such as pregnant cows:

	Yes	No	Do not know
* The transport of unweaned calves and other vulnerable animals should be prohibited (after a transition period)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Transport of unweaned calves and other vulnerable animals should be allowed only if the welfare and the control requirements are stricter	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
*			

The transport of unweaned calves and other vulnerable animals should be limited to 8 hours



### **Animal welfare at farm level:**

Directive 98/58/EC provides **general rules** to protect animals and fish of all species that are kept for the production of food, wool, skin or fur, or for other farming purposes.

In addition, more **specific requirements** have been laid down in the 4 Directives on pigs, calves, laying hens and broilers.

Since the EU legislation on the welfare of farm animals lays down **minimum standards**, national authorities are free to adopt more stringent rules (provided they are compatible with EU law).

### **\* 8. Should specific requirements for extra animal species be introduced?**

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

If YES, for which species/categories of animals:

- Dairy cows
- Beef cattle
- Sheep
- Goats
- Horses
- Minks
- Raccoon dogs
- Foxes
- Cats
- Dogs
- Rabbits
- Chicken pullets
- Chicken breeders
- Turkeys
- Ducks
- Geese
- Quail
- Farmed salmon

- Farmed trout
- Farmed carp
- Farmed sea bass
- Farmed sea bream
- Farmed European eel
- Invertebrate aquatic animals such as lobsters, crustaceans

**9. Currently, certain procedures are only allowed in the EU under specific circumstances and/or if not performed routinely.**

**How do you think the following mutilation practices should be addressed?**

	Prohibition	Additional restrictions	No action needed	Do not know
* Tail-docking (removing part of the pig's tail, to reduce the risk of tail biting in older pigs)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Castration (removing pigs' genitals, to avoid boar taint)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Dehorning (removing calves' horns, to avoid injuries)	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* Beak trimming (removing part of the beak of birds, to avoid feather pecking among birds)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**10. On 30 June 2021, the Commission announced that it will propose to phase out and finally prohibit the use of cages for the species listed below, in response to the European Citizens' Initiative "End the cage-age".**

**What should be the maximum time allowed for this phasing out?**

	Maximum 5 years	Maximum 10 years	Maximum 15 years	Do not know
* Sows (farrowing crates and sow stalls)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Laying hens	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Calves (individual pens)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Rabbits	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Pullets	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Broiler breeders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Layer breeders	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

* Quail	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Ducks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Geese	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>

**\* 11. Should imported products be subject to particular welfare requirements, such as “cage-free”?**

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

If YES, should these requirements be:

	Yes	No	Do not know
The same as those that apply to EU production?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
Equivalent to those applied to EU production?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Specific labelling rules to allow consumers to identify products produced under EU welfare conditions?	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Animal welfare at the time of killing:**

***12. Current EU legislation does not contain specific requirements for killing of farmed fish.***

***For other species, it provides a list of authorised methods, some of which have been scientifically challenged on animal welfare grounds – like the use of carbon dioxide at high concentration for pigs, and electrical water baths for poultry.***

***The use of electric prods to move animals in slaughterhouses is still allowed under certain conditions.***

**To what extent would you agree to the following statements?**

	Yes	No	Do not know
* Electrical water bath stunning for poultry should be prohibited (after a transition period)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

* Carbon dioxide (CO2) at high concentration, as a stunning method for pigs, should be prohibited (after a transition period)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The use of electric prods in slaughterhouses should be prohibited (after a transition period)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
* Specific rules for killing farmed fish should be adopted, to protect their welfare	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
* The systematic killing of one-day old male chicks should be prohibited (after a transition period)	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Animal welfare labelling:**

**\* 13. Would an EU animal welfare label be a useful tool for informing consumers on the conditions in which animals are treated?**

- Yes
- No
- Do not know

If YES, should an EU label apply:

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know
To all products of animal origin on the market?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Only to products of animal origin for which welfare standards going beyond the minimum EU legal requirements are applied?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

If YES, should such an EU animal welfare label:

	Strongly agree	Tend to agree	Tend to disagree	Strongly disagree	Do not know
Be limited to indicating farming methods that use cage systems or not?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Be based on broader animal welfare criteria, including requirements on animal transport and slaughter?	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**14. Is there any other comment you would like to add?**

Aanvullingen op de meerkeuzevragen

- Niet alle vragen zijn toegesneden op beantwoording door de overheid van lidstaten, maar we maken desalniettemin gebruik van deze mogelijkheid om input te leveren, gezien het belang van het onderwerp.
- Q4 over beter dierenwelzijn in de EU: Op de stelling over meer gebruikmaken van wetenschappelijke welzijnsindicatoren is "heel belangrijk" geantwoord, maar het is nog belangrijker om ook preventief met

goede omgevings- en managementvoorschriften te werken en niet alleen goede diergebonden indicatoren te hebben voor het meten en controleren van dierenwelzijn. Bij diergebonden indicatoren kan gebruik gemaakt worden van indicatoren voor zowel negatief dierenwelzijn als positief dierenwelzijn (negatieve aspecten moeten worden geminimaliseerd en positieve aspecten moeten worden bevorderd voor het dier).

- Q6 over het naleven van transportregels buiten de EU: op zowel “De uitvoer van levende dieren moet worden beperkt tot niet-EU-landen waar de voorschriften inzake dierenwelzijn minstens gelijkwaardig zijn aan die in de EU.” als “De uitvoer van levende dieren naar niet-EU-landen mag alleen worden toegestaan onder strengere controlevoorwaarden” is “nee” geantwoord omdat er op dit moment geen goede waarborging respectievelijk controle en handhaving mogelijk is bij de situaties buiten de EU.

- Q7 over niet gespeende kalveren/andere kwetsbare dieren: Op de stelling “Het vervoer van niet-gespeende kalveren en andere kwetsbare dieren moet (na een overgangperiode) worden verboden.” is “nee” geantwoord, maar er moet wel toegewerkt worden naar dat lange transporten niet meer toegestaan zijn. Aanvulling op het antwoord op de stelling “Het vervoer van niet-gespeende kalveren en andere kwetsbare dieren moet worden beperkt tot acht uur.” is dat voor kwetsbare dieren ook 8 uur te lang is.

- Q8 over het invoeren van diersoortvoorschriften: Nertsen, wasbeerhonden, vossen en kwartels zijn niet aangekruist omdat Nederland van mening is dat deze dieren o.a. niet welzijnsvriendelijk gehouden kunnen worden en er daarom een EU-breed verbod moet komen op het houden ervan i.p.v. specifieke voorschriften.

- Q9 over ingrepen: Op de stelling over castratie van biggen is geantwoord dat er “aanvullende bepalingen” nodig zijn, maar het streven is uiteindelijk op de lange termijn een verbod.

- Q10 over uitfasering kooihuisvesting: Het is belangrijk dat er nog nader te bepalen concrete uitfaseringstermijnen komen, bij voorkeur met integrale aandacht voor volksgezondheid en milieu.

- Q12 over doden: Voor koolstofdioxide in hoge concentratie als bedwelmingsmethode voor varkens is er een dringende noodzaak om alternatieven te ontwikkelen. Op de stelling “Het gebruik van elektrische prikstokken in slachthuizen moet (na een overgangperiode) worden verboden.” is “ik weet het niet” geantwoord, omdat er op dit moment voor bepaalde gevallen en situaties geen werkbare dierenwelzijnsvriendelijkere alternatieven bekend zijn. Daar moet aan worden gewerkt. Tot die alternatieven er zijn, zou het een verbetering zijn om bijvoorbeeld te specificeren welke spanning maximaal mag worden afgegeven door apparaten die elektrische schokken afgeven.

#### Suggesties vanuit Nederlandse overheid

Het belang van dierenwelzijn is in toenemende mate onderwerp van maatschappelijke, politieke en economische discussies. Het uitgangspunt is dat dieren een eigen, zelfstandige waarde hebben los van de gebruikswaarde die de mens aan de dieren toekent - een intrinsieke waarde – en de mens op een verantwoordelijke wijze omgaat met dieren. Voor toekomstbestendige houderijsystemen moet het uitgangspunt zijn dat houderijsystemen aan de behoeften van het dier worden aangepast, en niet andersom. Daarnaast moeten negatieve ervaringen worden geminimaliseerd en positieve ervaringen worden bevorderd voor het dier. Om op een uniforme wijze recht te doen aan de intrinsieke waarde van het dier in de gehele Europese Unie, is het volgens de Nederlandse overheid noodzakelijk om tot meer concrete dierenwelzijnsregelgeving/- voorschriften voor in principe alle bedrijfsmatig/commercieel gehouden en verhandelde dieren te komen in wetgeving die beter controleerbaar en handhaafbaar en tevens toekomstbestendig is om nieuwe wetenschappelijke inzichten te betrekken.

Nederland wil er naar toe dat alle dieren aan hun behoeften op het gebied van voeding, omgeving, gezondheid, gedrag en mentale toestand kunnen voldoen en dat dit geborgd wordt. Het model van de ‘5 vrijheden’ zou vervangen moeten worden door het model van de ‘5 domeinen’ (voeding, fysieke omgeving, gezondheid, mogelijkheden voor het uitoefenen van het soorteigen gedrag, mentale toestand) als basisconcept van dierenwelzijn in de EU-wetgeving. Het ‘5 domeinen’ model zou de basis moeten zijn voor betere normstelling in deze EU-wetgeving. Nederland heeft in een eerder stadium een gezamenlijke inbreng met de Vughtgroep landen aangeleverd bij de Commissie (st12512-ad01.en21 van 7 oktober 2021).



## Contact

[Contact Form](#)