



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Health and food audits and analysis

DG(SANTE) 2017-6099

**FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT
CARRIED OUT IN
HUNGARY
FROM 19 JUNE 2017 TO 23 JUNE 2017
IN ORDER TO
EVALUATE ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT TO NON-EU
COUNTRIES**

Executive Summary

This audit took place in Hungary from 19 to 23 June 2017 to evaluate the suitability and effectiveness of the measures in place to prevent causing any unnecessary pain, suffering or injury to animals during long distance transport by road to non-EU countries. In particular, the audit sought to identify the measures taken by competent authorities, organisers and transporters to allow the export of live animals to operate smoothly, while ensuring a satisfactory level of protection for the animals concerned.

The measures in place do provide satisfactory assurances that exports of live animals operate smoothly but they do not provide assurances that these journeys are correctly planned and carried out in line with animal welfare requirements to prevent causing unnecessary pain, suffering or injury to the animals.

Inadequate route planning causing extended journey times is the major non-compliance detected in Hungarian exports to Turkey. Consignments are sent to non-EU countries when climate conditions are extreme (hot) and in lorries whose ventilation systems are not capable of keeping animals in the required range of temperatures. These two factors are causing unnecessary suffering to animals during long transport by road to non-EU countries.

Central level guidelines, including the need to supervise all loadings at time of departure, have reduced some other risks for animal welfare. Official controls at district level are not adequately verified and are not implemented effectively, which risks creating animal welfare problems during long distance transport by road.

There has been inadequate progress in rectifying the above deficiencies and others which were already reported during the last audit to Hungary on animal welfare during transport in 2011.

Cooperation between one large exporter/transporter and an animal welfare non-governmental organisation has led to the development of innovative vehicle designs and an intensive driver/company training programme which should lead to better conditions for animals transported by the operator and could act as an example for other counties/transporters willing to improve standards.

Transporters have responded adequately to NÉBIH's request to improve certain aspects of journey planning such as control post bookings, improvements to contingency plans and additional vehicle drinkers, which will help somewhat to mitigate the effects of unexpected delays but do not give sufficient guarantees on contingency planning at the border.

The central level of the competent authority intends to start using reports from Trade Control and Expert System to prioritise which district offices and transporters to target for risk-based controls in order to improve conditions for animals exported to non-EU countries.

The report makes recommendations to the competent authority to address the shortcomings identified.

Table of Contents

| | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Objectives and scope | 1 |
| 3 | Legal Basis | 2 |
| 4 | Background | 2 |
| 5 | Findings and Conclusions | 3 |
| 5.1 | Official Controls | 3 |
| 5.2 | Transport Conditions | 5 |
| 5.3 | Resting | 8 |
| 5.4 | Unexpected Delays at the Border | 9 |
| 6 | Overall Conclusions | 11 |
| 7 | Closing Meeting | 11 |
| 8 | Recommendations | 12 |

ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

| Abbreviation | Explanation |
|---------------------|---|
| EU | European Union |
| NÉBIH | National Food Chain Safety Office <i>Nemzeti Élelmiszerlánc - Biztonsági Hivatal</i> |
| OV | Official veterinarian |
| TRACES | Trade Control and Expert System |

1 INTRODUCTION

This audit took place in Hungary from 19 to 23 June 2017 as part of the planned audit programme of DG Health and Food Safety. An opening meeting was held with the Hungarian competent authorities on 19 June 2017. At this meeting, the objectives of, and itinerary for, the audit were confirmed by the audit team and additional information required for the satisfactory completion of the audit was requested.

The audit team comprised two auditors from DG Health and Food Safety and one national expert from a Member State and was accompanied throughout the audit by representatives from the central competent authority the National Food Chain Safety Office (NÉBIH).

2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the suitability and effectiveness of the measures in place to prevent causing any unnecessary pain, suffering or injury to animals during long distance transport by road to non-EU countries.

In particular the audit sought to identify the measures taken by competent authorities, organisers and transporters to allow the export of live animals to operate smoothly, while ensuring a satisfactory level of protection for the animals concerned.

The scope of the audit included:

- National measures and, where relevant, any national policies on the welfare of animals during transport, in particular in the context of exports from the EU; and
- Official controls on the welfare of ruminants (cattle, sheep and goats) during transport to non-EU countries, including the system for certifying the health status of such animals, and their outcomes in particular controls prior to and after the journey; and
- Other activities having an influence on the welfare of ruminants (cattle, sheep and goats) intended for transport to non-EU countries.
- A review of documents relevant to reach the objectives of the audit for the period January 2015 – May 2017.

The main legal requirements are included in:

- Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations;
- Council Directive 96/93/EC on the certification of animals and animal products, where applicable;
- Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

In pursuit of the objectives, the following meetings were held:

| Meetings with Competent Authorities | | | Comments |
|--|---------|---|--|
| Competent authority | Central | 2 | Opening and closing meeting |
| | Other | 6 | County and District level authorities |
| Site visits | | | Meetings with 3 transporters/exporters regularly carrying out long distance transports to non-EU countries |
| Assembly Centre & Transporter's premises | | 2 | |

3 LEGAL BASIS

The audit was carried out under the general provisions of EU legislation and in particular Article 28 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations, and Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules.

EU legal acts quoted in this report are provided in Annex 1 and refer, where applicable, to the last amended version.

4 BACKGROUND

Enforcement of animal welfare requirements during transport remains a challenge. There have been several reports to the Commission of long delays of live animal transports at the EU land border with Turkey. After a sudden drop in exports to Turkey between 2012 and 2013 this trade has been increasing significantly in recent years. The number of live ruminants exported to Turkey in 2016 (more than 290,000) has surpassed the numbers for 2011 (more than 280,000). In response to these reports, complaints from non-governmental organisations and following a meeting with national contact points, the Commission services wrote to all Member States in June 2016 urging them to improve official controls in this area. The letter emphasised the importance of proper planning of long distance journeys, with particular focus on: adequate contingency planning; temperature requirements; and the provision of sufficient water, feed and bedding for the duration of these long journeys.

To follow up on this issue, DG Health and Food Safety planned a series of audits for 2017 and 2018 to identify activities that are suitable and effective in improving animal welfare during long distance transport to non-EU countries. The Commission will share the outcomes from these audits with all Member States in order to help with the uniform application of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005. This audit to Hungary is the second of the series.

Hungarian companies are in the top three of the EU for sending animals to Turkey: animals either exported from Hungary or transported by Hungarian transporters from other Member States. Data (see Annex) about live animal exports from Hungary recorded in the Commission's Trade Control and Expert System (TRACES) indicates that non-compliances for Hungarian transporters detected at the Bulgarian exit point in 2016/17 related mainly to inadequate journey planning and were 5.3% of all consignments.

5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

5.1 OFFICIAL CONTROLS

Legal requirements

Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Findings

1. The country profile of Hungary describes the structure of the competent authorities and the organisation of official controls on animal welfare during transport. It is accessible at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/country_profiles/details.cfm?co_id=HU
2. A previous audit to Hungary on animal welfare during transport (report DG(SANCO) 2011/6045) identified shortcomings on vehicle approvals (suitability of watering devices, ventilation systems), controls to verify journey times and use of satellite navigation systems and temperature data on a risk basis, controls of space allowances and ventilation above animals, and verification of the effectiveness of controls. It made recommendations to address them and enhance the control systems in place. The Hungarian authorities took a number of measures at central level between 2011 and 2017 aimed at improving the system of controls and addressing these recommendations.
3. In addition, NÉBIH issued a number of updated guidelines on animal welfare during long journeys to transporters and county offices throughout 2016. This was in response to the Zuchtvieh judgement¹ and to problems reported at the border with Turkey. They required that:
 - a. Operators' planning of long journeys and district officials' verification of them should take into account conditions in the non-EU leg of the journey. Where there are no resting places in the non-EU country, stocking density should be decreased by 20%, and appropriate drinkers and back-up portable watering equipment should be carried in vehicles;
 - b. Where temperatures on the route exceed 30°C, the space allowances for animals must be increased by at least 30 %;

¹ Judgement of the European Court of Justice (Fifth Chamber) of 23 April 2015 – Case C-424/13

- c. In order to provide adequate ventilation the minimum internal height of the vehicle must be at least 20 cm higher than the withers of the highest animal;
 - d. Drivers must check more frequently on animal conditions and use fans when vehicles are at a standstill in heat. Whenever possible, vehicles transporting animals should be parked in the shade;
 - e. Checks on journey planning should take into account the border crossing between Bulgaria and Turkey, the opening hours of the Turkish veterinary services, and reflect at least the minimum time of six and a half hours to cross the border;
 - f. Written confirmation of a control post booking and declarations concerning how the provision of food, water and bedding throughout the journey will be achieved as well as a written contingency plan on how drivers can react to potential emergency situations should be supplied by organisers;
 - g. Journey logs must have all relevant information submitted including the border as a transit point and the name of the final destination.
4. The County offices provide training for district offices mainly on certification of animals but also on welfare issues. During 2016 NÉBIH required all counties to give training on animal welfare requirements to those district official veterinarians dispatching consignments for long journeys. NÉBIH supplied training materials (including the elements in paragraph 3 a-g above) and all officials were trained by December 2016.
 5. Most officials at district level did not take into account the training or instructions regarding the time taken to cross the border at Turkey and the working hours of Turkish veterinary authorities there, in their verification of journey log planning (see paragraphs 26 to 28 below). This resulted in incorrect journey planning and animals subjected to routinely longer journey times.
 6. Staff at district level generally did not know how to check certain requirements requested by NÉBIH, e.g. approving vehicle deck surface areas and suitability of drinkers or analysis of retrospective satellite navigation system or temperature records from long journeys (see paragraphs 10, 11, 12, 26 27 and 28 below). This is despite training and guidance from both central and county level. This lack of knowledge or competence in carrying out tasks at district level is not in compliance with Article 6 of Regulation 882/2004.
 7. There is no verification of the district level work due to budgetary constraints, though a framework for doing so is in place. The district levels could not demonstrate adherence to documented procedures and this was not known to higher levels. This is not in compliance with Article 8 of Regulation 882/2004. District officials at times took decisions based on discussions with transporters rather than confirming themselves that requirements are met or following NÉBIH guidance.

Conclusions on Official Controls

8. There has been inadequate progress in rectifying the deficiencies reported during the Commission audit to Hungary DG(SANCO) 2011/6045 on animal welfare during transport. Actions taken by the Hungarian authorities to rectify the deficiencies were ineffective as the same deficiencies were found at district level in 2017.
9. Official controls at district level do not ensure transporter's compliance. This together with the absence of verification in a number of key areas might cause unnecessary pain or suffering to animals during long distance transport by road to non-EU countries.

5.2 TRANSPORT CONDITIONS

Legal requirements

Articles 14, 15, 18 and 26 and Chapters II, III and VI, Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Findings

10. Vehicle approval renewals are subject to the same process as new vehicles. There is extensive written guidance available for consultation for district official veterinarians (OVs) who approve vehicles for long journeys. This includes specific guidance on suitability of drinkers but not on measuring vehicle space allowances. There is no systematic training for OVs, but some have taken part in Better Training for Safer Food courses and meetings between counties and districts allow dissemination of this information. A note from NÉBIH also draws attention to the need for accurate vehicle deck areas to calculate appropriate stocking densities and to verify the suitability of drinking devices for the species of animals being transported.
11. The audit team reviewed vehicle approval certificates. All but one of them were inaccurate with regard to the calculation of deck surface area: many listed only an overall area for multi-deck vehicles, or the same deck surface areas for multi-deck trucks, including those with goose-neck decks at the front. This is not in compliance with the requirements necessary to correctly issue the vehicle certificate in Article 18 of Regulation 1/2005 and the specifications required to be completed in the certificate listed in Annex III Chapter IV of Regulation 1/2005. District officials relied upon the figures provided by vehicle manufacturers' which were not always accurate.
12. Vehicle drinking devices were not physically verified at the time of approval by the district OVs. They assumed vehicle manufacturers' would fit suitable drinkers for the species that the vehicles was listed as being capable of transporting. This is not in compliance with Article 18 of Regulation 1/2005 or in line with NÉBIH guidance. Vehicles approval certificates were issued for different species and ages of animals which would require different non-compatible drinking systems e.g. horses, rabbits,

calves and pigs on one certificate and would lead to some animals being unable to drink during rest stops due to the unsuitability of drinkers.

13. Increased space allowances for animals of up to and beyond 20% was indicated in journey logs for two of the three transporters met. They were based on the deck surface area indicated in the vehicle approval certificate. The exception was one of the bigger exporter/transporters visited where the district OV indicated using discretion to allow exports to take place at almost normal stocking densities (+10%) - disregarding the guidance from NÉBIH.
14. Officials at district level did not recognise the physical limitations imposed by vehicle design height restrictions and the carriage of two decks of average height large adult cattle. There was a recent instruction issued (see also paragraph 3c above) but no clear practical guidance (vehicle and animal schematics) from NÉBIH on this. Adequate headspace and therefore ventilation was not ensured when large adult cattle (over 500kg) were transported e.g. the guidance from NÉBIH for 20cm space requirement above the withers of large bulls on two decks (which must be stacked in some way) on conventional trucks would require a minimum² vehicle height of over 4.8m. i.e. it is not possible to load large adult cattle on two decks in conventional livestock vehicles while providing adequate headspace. This is not in compliance with Annex I, Chapter II, point 1 (1.2) of Regulation 1/2005 and NÉBIH guidance. For the most-modern, modified two-deck vehicles, and for other smaller categories of cattle this was satisfactory.
15. The audit team observed a number of good practices at one large transporter/exporter. The company was working closely with a non-governmental animal welfare organisation (NGO) to redesign new vehicles to include a number of modifications to improve the transport of animals for long journeys: e.g. additional ventilation, sealed deck/wall junctions, lowered floors to increase ventilation, additional access points and modified drinkers and partitions. The company also used the NGO's experience and literature to train all their drivers and it reported a very positive outcome. The company also developed a useful mobile phone application for their drivers for working out stocking densities, listing legislative requirements and logistical information (contacts and language phrases). The operator accepted operating with lower profits per animal transported in order to improve animal welfare and indicated they were frustrated that inconsistent enforcement allows lower standard operators to gain market share and drive down prices to the detriment of animal welfare standards in Europe.
16. According to NÉBIH instructions, fitness for transport is to be checked at the moment of loading for all consignments destined to non-EU countries. Loading checklists require the district officials to sign that the criteria listed in paragraph 3 of this report (a, b, c, f

² This is calculated taking into account: the animals height, normally at least 1.5 to 1.6 m multiplied by two, plus twice the ventilation requirement 20cm and the height of the first vehicle deck off the ground (1.1 to 1.2m) and the thickness of the floors of decks two and three (+24 cm).

and g) are complied with before a journey starts. All checklists seen were completed as satisfactory by the OV's.

17. The poor implementation of vehicle approval requirements (surface area and drinkers) and problems with ventilation and space above large animals' heads would negate the usefulness and veracity of certain aspects of these checks. On the other hand, the very low percentage of unfit animals reported from the non-compliances detected during controls at the Bulgarian border (see annex) points to the positive outcome of systematic controls on the physical fitness of animals for loading and transport. Systematic checking fitness at the moment of loading can be considered a good practice and goes beyond the requirements of Article 15 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 which does not require carrying out systematic checks at the moment of loading.
18. The vehicles seen by the audit team during the audit were in good condition. As required by the NÉBIH instructions they also carried additional portable drinkers. None of the vehicles seen was equipped with cooling equipment for the livestock.
19. Long distance transport of animals at temperatures above 30°C is permitted by NÉBIH. All satellite navigation records examined for journeys to Turkey in summer demonstrated that the temperature inside the vehicles consistently exceeded 30 °C for certain parts of journeys. Taking into account the limitations of transporting animals for long journeys in vehicles incapable of regulating internal temperatures to comply with the range of temperature requirements as laid down in Annex I, Chapter VI, point 3 (3.1) of Regulation 1/2005, this is not in compliance with Article 3 (c) of the same Regulation. NÉBIH has asked the counties and districts to focus on mitigating the associated risks by: increasing space for the animals, giving more headspace and ensuring realistic journey planning to take account of the typical delays entering Turkey.

Conclusions on transport conditions

20. NÉBIH guidelines together with supervision of loadings at the time of departure have had an impact on reducing risks regarding fitness to travel and space allowances. The supervision of loadings is a good practice going beyond EU requirements.
21. The poor standard for approval leads to a risk of inadequate space allowances and unsuitable drinking devices, during long journeys and thus to welfare problems for the animals transported. The inadequate measuring of deck floor surface areas and assessment of drinking devices at the time of approving the vehicle leads to incorrect calculations on stocking densities – as they are based on the deck surface area indicated in the vehicle approval certificate. Therefore, reductions in stocking density indicated in most journey logs for summer consignments are often inaccurate.
22. The requirements for adequate headspace and therefore ventilation provision for large adult cattle in two-tier vehicles is not respected causing unnecessary suffering to these animals during long distance transport by road to non-EU countries. The actions

proposed in response to previous DG SANTE recommendations on these issues were not effective as they have not been properly implemented at district level.

23. The absence of cooling equipment for livestock in approved lorries implies that they will not be able to maintain the animals at the temperature range specified in Regulation 1/2005 during long journeys with regular external temperatures over 30°C, which will result in causing unnecessary pain and suffering. The actions proposed in response to previous DG SANTE recommendations on these issues were not effective as they have not been properly implemented at district level.
24. The liaison between one large exporter/transporter and an animal welfare NGO led to the development of innovative vehicle designs and an intensive driver/company training programme which should lead to better conditions for animals transported by the operator.

5.3 RESTING

Legal requirements

Articles 14, 15, 19, 25 and 26 and Chapter V, Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Findings

25. The audit team saw evidence that control post bookings were routinely sought and provided during pre-transport planning controls.
26. NÉBIH request transporters to return all journey logs after the journey and districts do follow up on non-returned documents. The NÉBIH animal welfare control plan requires counties to report monthly the checks of satellite navigation systems and temperature records for two consignments a month. NÉBIH also gave counties specific TRACES certificate numbers during the summer to review. Districts did not report any non-compliances to NÉBIH from the reviews of journey logs, navigation systems data and temperature records.
27. The audit team reviewed returned journey logs, navigation systems data and temperature records. Journey plans (section 1 of the journey log) were not always completed to the final place of destination, nor was the border crossing to Kapikule indicated as a stopping point in many. Operators planning journeys and OV's tasked with verifying the planning had not taken on board the NÉBIH guidance on the time to cross the border or the opening hours of border authorities.
28. Satellite navigation systems records showed that many journeys were taking far longer than the planning indicated in the journey logs. Despite the availability of clear navigation records, there were no records of actions taken to compare journey planning with the reality given by this data. None of these irregularities had been noted nor had any remedial action had been taken by the district officials in these cases. Effective

verification of journey planning required in Articles 14 and 15 of Regulation 1/2005 was not in place and journeys which were not in compliance with the limits for journey times laid down in Annex I, Chapter V of Regulation 1/2005 were permitted.

29. Reports of non-compliances by Hungarian transporters have been regularly communicated in TRACES from the Bulgarian competent authorities at the border with Turkey to NÉBIH and the district authorities (see table in annex). Almost all the non-compliances were noted in the TRACES category "Other". The lack of further categorisation of non-compliances listed in TRACES as "Other" has made it difficult for the receiving authorities to follow up on these cases; though attempts were made by some district offices.
30. Additional information recently received from the Bulgarian authorities indicates that the majority of the notifications labelled as "Other" in TRACES concerned consignments which were likely to exceed journey times once they had left the Bulgarian exit point and entered no-man's land between Bulgaria and Turkey. This indicates a widespread problem with the timing and planning of the journeys. However, the vast majority of the notifications did arise during the period when the control post at Haskovo, in Bulgaria, was not available for use by transporters between April and November 2016.
31. NÉBIH indicated its intention to start using reports from TRACES to prioritise which district offices and transporters to target for risk-based controls in order to improve conditions for animals exported to non-EU countries.

Conclusions on resting

32. Despite clear instructions from NÉBIH to the districts to address the deficiencies noted in the last DG SANTE audit on transport on the realism and appropriateness of proposed journey times and the verification of completed journey times through satellite navigation systems and documentary review, official controls at district level are poorly implemented leading to overly long journeys for animals.

5.4 UNEXPECTED DELAYS AT THE BORDER

Legal requirements

Article 11 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.

Findings

33. NÉBIH ensures that Turkish and other non-EU country requirements for animal health and welfare certification are updated as necessary and that district levels are notified of changes. Officials at district level were aware of these notification procedures and where to obtain up-to-date information. They also liaised closely with Turkish importers and

veterinarians to ensure that animal health requirements were adhered to. There were very few instances of problems with animal health certificates reported from the Bulgarian border to operators, district level or NÉBIH.

34. Transporters and drivers were well aware of the instructions indicated in paragraph 3 above and had modified generic contingency plans accordingly, with more detailed instructions to use additional drinkers (containers), stop more frequently at petrol stations to fill tanks, and if alarms signal that temperatures are more than 35°C inside vehicles, fans must be kept turned on and more frequent checks of animals made. The verification of control post bookings was seen as satisfactory by district OV's to address the need for replenishing feed, bedding and water requirements.
35. NÉBIH is not requesting a specific contingency plan as suggested by the Commission in its letter to all CVOs of 28 June 2016 in relation to animals transported for long journeys to non-EU countries. More detailed provisions in contingency planning are missing to ensure that animals are not subjected to unnecessary suffering contrary to Article 3(a) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.
36. Transporters do not describe, in a specific contingency plan, how, where necessary, at other stages of the journey such as unexpected long delays at the Turkish border in particular, bedding, feed and water would be provided to animals at this location. This is not requested in detail by district OV's when evaluating the transporters' contingency plans.
37. Transporters explained that it was possible (and how) to obtain water and buy feed even if vehicles are blocked for an extended period in no-mans' land between Bulgaria and Turkey. One transporter also stated that, when transporting animals to Turkey, the timing of the journey is organised in order to have the animals rested and present for the border controls before the opening time of the Turkish controls (as indicated in the letter to the CVOs of June 2016). This is considered a good practice that provides for more time for these checks and attempts to avoid the hottest part of the day.

Conclusions on unexpected delays at the border

38. The system of animal health certification is not causing noticeable additional delays in the clearance of animals at the Turkish border and is not contributing to unnecessary pain, suffering or injury to animals due to unexpected delays.
39. Transporters have responded adequately to NÉBIH's request to improve certain aspects of journey planning such as control post bookings, improvements to contingency plans and additional vehicle drinkers, which will help somewhat to mitigate the effects of unexpected delays but do not give sufficient guarantees on contingency planning at the border.

6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

The measures in place do provide satisfactory assurances that exports of live animals operate smoothly but they do not provide assurances that these journeys are correctly planned and carried out in line with animal welfare requirements to prevent causing unnecessary pain, suffering or injury to the animals.

Inadequate route planning causing extended journey times is the major non-compliance detected in Hungarian exports to Turkey. Consignments are sent to non-EU countries when climate conditions are extreme (hot) in lorries whose ventilation systems are not capable of keeping animals in the required range of temperatures. These two factors are causing unnecessary suffering to animals during long transport by road to non-EU countries.

Central level guidelines, including the need to supervise all loadings at time of departure, have reduced some other risks for animal welfare. Official controls at district level are not adequately verified and are not implemented effectively, which risks creating animal welfare problems during long distance transport by road.

There has been inadequate progress in rectifying the above deficiencies and others which were already reported during the last audit to Hungary on animal welfare during transport in 2011.

Cooperation between one large exporter/transporter and an animal welfare NGO has led to the development of innovative vehicle designs and an intensive driver/company training programme which should lead to better conditions for animals transported by the operator and could act as an example for other counties/transporters willing to improve standards.

Transporters have responded adequately to NÉBIH's request to improve certain aspects of journey planning such as control post bookings, improvements to contingency plans and additional vehicle drinkers, which will help somewhat to mitigate the effects of unexpected delays but do not give sufficient guarantees on contingency planning at the border.

The central level of the competent authority intends to start using reports from Trade Control and Expert System to prioritise which district offices and transporters to target for risk-based controls in order to improve conditions for animals exported to non-EU countries.

7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 23 June 2017 with representatives of the competent authorities, at which the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit were presented by the audit team.

8 RECOMMENDATIONS

The competent authorities are invited to provide, within 25 working days of receipt of the report, an action plan containing details of the actions taken and planned, including deadlines for their completion, aimed at addressing the recommendations set out below:

| No. | Recommendation |
|-----|---|
| 1. | <p>The competent authority should ensure that officials at district level have the competence to carry out effective controls, as requested by NÉBIH, and in accordance with Article 6 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, and should consider in doing so, the reasons why NÉBIH directed follow up-action and training have not been able to address previous DG SANTE recommendations since 2011, and put in place suitable measures to address the root causes.</p> <p>Recommendation based on conclusions 8 and 9.</p> <p>Associated finding: 4, 5 and 6.</p> |
| 2. | <p>The competent authority should ensure that verification of the effectiveness of district level work in the area of animal welfare during transport is put in place in compliance with Article 8 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.</p> <p>Recommendation based on conclusions 8 and 9.</p> <p>Associated finding: 5, 6, and 7.</p> |
| 3. | <p>The competent authority should ensure that the current system for approving means of transport for long distances includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• proper guidance and assessment of the suitability of vehicles' drinking systems for different types of animals and different categories of those types, as required by Annex I, Chapter VI, point 2.2 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and;• that individual vehicle deck surface areas are correctly measured and are also made identifiable in the vehicle approval certificates as laid down in Annex III Chapter IV of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 and as required in Article (18) 1(b) of the same Regulation; <p>Recommendation based on conclusion 21.</p> <p>Associated finding: 10, 11 and 12.</p> |
| 4. | <p>The competent authority should make suitable instructions and guidance (including, if necessary diagrams) available to ensure that the requirements for suitable ventilation above transported animals, as laid down in NÉBIH existing instructions,</p> |

| No. | Recommendation |
|------------|--|
| | <p>and as required by Annex I, Chapter I, point 1,1.2 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 are implemented by transporters and correctly verified by district officials at the time of loading.</p> <p>Recommendation based on conclusion 22.</p> <p>Associated finding: 14.</p> |
| 5. | <p>The competent authority should ensure that, taking into account the limitations of transporting animals for long journeys in vehicles incapable of regulating internal temperatures to comply with the range of temperature requirements as laid down in Annex I, Chapter VI, point 3 (3.1), animals should not be transported for long distance in temperatures known to be consistently above 30 °C and thus not subjected to distress as required in Article 3 c) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.</p> <p>Recommendation based on conclusion 23.</p> <p>Associated finding: 3 and 19.</p> |
| 6. | <p>The competent authority should ensure, bearing in mind recommendation 1 above, that effective controls on journey planning and verification of returned journey documentation are undertaken as required by Articles 14 and 15 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 respectively.</p> <p>Recommendation based on conclusion 32.</p> <p>Associated finding: 26, 27 and 28.</p> |
| 7. | <p>The competent authority should ensure that contingency plans of transporters exporting live animals include specific measures to meet the animals' needs for bedding, feed and water in the eventuality of unexpected long delays at the border as required by Articles 3(a) and 11(1)(b)(iv) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.</p> <p>Recommendation based on conclusion 39.</p> <p>Associated finding: 35 and 36.</p> |

The competent authority's response to the recommendations can be found at:

http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2017-6099

ANNEX 1 – LEGAL REFERENCES

| Legal Reference | Official Journal | Title |
|---------------------------------|--|---|
| Reg. 882/2004 - Article 45 (MS) | OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1 | 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 |
| Reg. 1/2005 | OJ L 3, 5.1.2005, p. 1-44 | Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations and amending Directives 64/432/EEC and 93/119/EC and Regulation (EC) No 1255/97 |
| Reg. 882/2004 | OJ L 165, 30.4.2004, p. 1, Corrected and re-published in OJ L 191, 28.5.2004, p. 1 | 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 |
| Dir. 96/93/EC | OJ L 13, 16.1.1997, p. 28-30 | Council Directive 96/93/EC of 17 December 1996 on the certification of animals and animal products |

ANNEX 2: NUMBER OF LONG JOURNEY CONSIGNMENTS FOR EXPORT FROM HUNGARY

| January 2016 to April 2017 | | |
|--|---|------------|
| Cattle | 3059 | |
| Sheep | 161 | |
| Goats | 0 | |
| 2016 | | |
| Cattle consignments for export | 3126 (32.2% to Turkey) | |
| Subjected to animal welfare checks (%) – anywhere along the journey but mostly at the exit point from the EU | >2981 (>95.4%) | |
| Transported by | transporters authorised by Hungary | 77.8% |
| | transporters authorised by Bulgaria | 7.7% |
| | transporters authorised by Croatia | 5.9% |
| | transporters from 9 other Member States | 8.6% |
| Total consignments reported with animal welfare non-compliance (%) | | 166 (5.3%) |
| Main non-compliances reported, by category: | | |
| Other | 110 | |
| Travel times exceeded | 31 | |