



BIOLOGICAL HAZARDS & ANIMAL HEALTH AND WELFARE UNIT

Scientific Panel on Animal Health and Welfare

Minutes of the 141st Plenary meeting

Held on 1 June 2022

EFSA, Parma, WEB MEETING¹

(Agreed on 16/06/2022)

Participants

■ **Panel Members:**

ALVAREZ Julio, BICOUT Dominique, CALISTRI Paolo, CANALI Elisabetta, DREWE Julian, GARIN-BASTUJI Bruno, GONZALES ROJAS Jose Luis, HERSKIN Mette, MICHEL Virginie, MIRANDA Miguel Angel, NIELSEN Søren Saxmose (Chair), PADALINO Barbara, PASQUALI Paolo, SPOOLDER Hans, VELARDE Antonio, VILTROP Arvo

■ **European Commission:**

HOLMES Rebecca, RALCHEV Stanislav and ZAFEIROPOULOU Kornilia

■ **EFSA:**

BIOHAW Unit: ANTONIOU Sotiria-Eleni, ASHE Sean, AZNAR Inma, BALDINELLI Francesca, BROGLIA Alessandro, CANDIANI Denise, DHOLLANDER Sofie, FABRIS Chiara, GEFFROY Mariana, GERVELMEYER Andrea, KOHNLE Lisa, LIEBANA-CRIADO Ernesto (HoU), LIMA Eliana, MUR Lina, ROJO GIMENO Cristina, OSWALDI Verena, VAN DER STEDE Yves, VITALI Marika, ZANCANARO Gabriele; MESE Unit: MOSBACH-SCHULZ Olaf

■ **Hearing experts²:** not applicable

¹ All meetings were rescheduled to web meetings due to Covid-19

² As defined in Article 17 of the Decision of the Executive Director concerning the selection of members of the Scientific Committee, the Scientific Panels, and the selection of external experts to assist EFSA with its scientific work: <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/expertselection.pdf>.



1. Declarations of Interests

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence³ and the Decision of the Executive Director on Competing Interest Management⁴, EFSA screened the Annual Declarations of Interest filled in by the Scientific Panel Members invited for the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting had been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

2. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the meeting participants. Apologies were received from GORTAZAR SCHMIDT Christian, ROBERTS Helen and WINCKLER Christoph.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 140th Plenary meeting held on 4-5 May 2022, WEB

The minutes of the 140th Plenary meeting were agreed by written procedure and published on 25 May 2022.

5. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion and possible adoption/endorsement

5.1. Art 29. Methodology for the development of welfare mandates in the context of Farm-to-Fork strategy ([EFSA-Q-2021-00672](#))

The Panel discussed the comments made during the review of the draft guidance document and agreed on modifications of the text.

The following modifications were proposed and agreed: i) the formulation of the recommendations in the Common TORs of the mandates were phrased like this: 'provide recommendations on the measures to prevent and correct the hazards and to mitigate the welfare consequences'; ii) the formulation of the feasibility on ABMs and how sensitivity and specificity will be assessed qualitatively (section 3.1.1.1); iii) alphabetic ordering of Table 2 (list and description of Welfare Consequences) and Table 3 (list and description of list and description of negative affective states). In addition, it was agreed to keep STRESS and DISTRESS in Table 3 (and a footnote on STRESS to explain that the term stress does not describe a negative affective state in itself, but it is mentioned and defined in the table as it is a prerequisite of distress) iv) the formulation of the proposed model/method to provide qualitative/quantitative recommendations for specific scenarios ToRs and its related uncertainty (section 3.2.1.3); v) the formulation of the methodology for future mandates in the section Conclusion.

In a separate meeting two days after AHAW Panel meeting, the exact formulation of the ABMs (Point ii, Section 3.1.1.1.) was finetuned with the task force on Animal welfare. The following formulations and examples on sensitivity and specificity were agreed: ABMs were qualitatively assessed on their 'sensitivity' and 'specificity' to the welfare consequences (WC). For sensitivity, the following was

³ http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/policy_independence.pdf

⁴ http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/competing_interest_management_17.pdf



considered: the presence of the ABM as its ability to identify animals suffering from the welfare consequence. An ABM that will not be systematically present in all animals with the WC will be less sensitive. For specificity, the following was considered: the absence of the ABM as its ability to identify the animals which are not suffering from the WC. An ABM that will be present in several WCs will tend to be less specific. Lying behaviour is an example of a sensitive and specific ABM for identifying resting problems in pigs as resting problems are always associated with reduced lateral lying and if there are no resting problems, pigs will exhibit normal lateral lying behaviour. Teat lesions in lactating sows is an example of a non-sensitive and non-specific ABM for identifying resting problems as if resting problems are present, these may not always be associated with teat lesions and if resting problems are truly absent, lactating sows may still have teat lesions due to for example poor floor quality. The document was unanimously adopted.

5.2. Art 29. Scientific opinion concerning the protection of animals during transport (Sheep and goats [EFSA-Q-2021-00433](#))

The title of the opinion was changed to include 'welfare' in the title, replacing the word 'protection'. Table 5: List and description of the negative states that animals may experience, when exposed to at least one of the WCs listed above, is to be amended due to a change in approach for stress. In relation to the naming of ABMs the consensus is to use the simple title not referring to an increased or decreased ABM e.g. heart rate rather than increased heart rate. Regarding Figure 1: Fetal growth curve of lambs: a decision was made to better describe its relevance. Due to lack of time and number of available experts, the impact of the sources of uncertainty in the conclusions was not quantified. This should be mentioned in the relevant concluding sentence. Conclusions relating to journey times were amended based on the summaries of each of the welfare consequences experienced by sheep during the transit stage of transport. The recommendations were adjusted to reflect this change. The opinion was unanimously adopted.

6. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion

6.1. Art. 29. Scientific opinion concerning the protection of Pigs ([EFSA-Q-2020-00484](#))

The draft Opinion was discussed in depth and the following changes were agreed: i) the title of the opinion was changed to include the word 'welfare' in the title, replacing 'protection'; ii) on the amount of references cited in the Chapters addressing General ToRs: most references are in the sections addressing General ToRs 1, 2 and 3; the sections addressing General ToRs 4 and 5 are mainly based on reviews (e.g. SVC, 1997) and only new references are added; iii) on Conclusions and Recommendations (C&Rs): each Chapter reporting the assessment of the welfare of the diverse pig categories will be followed by the relevant C&Rs. Following EFSA template, the list of C&Rs will be repeated at the end of the document, where the certainty range will be added to the Conclusions. In addition, C&Rs can refer to tables, figures or Sections of the document; iv) on farrowing systems and the time needed for adaptation to a new system: it was concluded that a transition period is an important mitigating measure during which particular attention is required, to reduce welfare problems; v) on sensitivity and specificity of the ABMs (General ToR 3): they will be revised one more time in line with the discussion on the methodological guidance but in principle the assessment as is it in the current opinion is correct.

The Opinion will be submitted for possible adoption at the next AHAW Panel Plenary meeting, to be held at the end of June 2022.



6.2. Art 29. Scientific opinion concerning the protection of animals during transport: animals in Containers ([EFSA-Q-2020-00482](#))

The draft Opinion was discussed in depth and the following changes were agreed: i) related to prolonged hunger, two conclusions are reached with two thresholds (6 h and 12 h from feed withdrawal): it is appropriate that the uncertainty analysis is reported throughout the assessment section (and summary) and not only in the conclusions; ii) related to on-farm fasting of the animals, although the Opinion states there is no welfare benefits in fasting the animals, it needs to be clarified that better hygienic conditions during transport can also be obtained if animals are fasted (and not only at the abattoir); iii) related to sensitivity and specificity of the ABMs: they will be revised one more time in line with the discussion on the methodological guidance but in principle the assessment as is it in the current opinion is correct; iv) related to outcome tables: it was agreed that, although they would be good to have as summaries, there will be no time to produce them; v) related to the indication of maximum time for feed withdrawal before transport: it is not possible to indicate how long the catching and loading phases last in average due to the big variety in farm size. The Opinion will be submitted for possible adoption at the end of June 2022.

6.3. 29. Scientific opinion concerning the protection of animals during transport horses ([EFSA-Q-2022-00032](#))

The comments and decisions made with reference to sheep will also be applied to horses. In general, a better description of the different types of horses is needed. There was a short presentation of the status and the progress with the agreed conclusions on microclimatic conditions and space allowance. The conclusions on journey time will be based on the table summarising the ABMs for the selected welfare consequence and what happens to them over time. The table will be duplicated where necessary for different types of transport, i.e. horses in a group or horses in a single stall. This scientific Opinion is due for adoption at the end of June.

6.4. Art. 29. Scientific opinion concerning the protection of animals during transport (Cattle [EFSA-Q-2020-00481](#))

The comments and decisions made with reference to the sheep opinion will also be applied to the cattle Opinion where appropriate. The draft conclusions and recommendations for journey breaks were presented and discussed. The draft conclusions and recommendations for un-weaned calves were presented. This Scientific Opinion is due for adoption at the end of June 2022.

6.5. Art. 29. Scientific opinion concerning the protection of animals during transport (Pigs [EFSA-Q-2021-00434](#))

The comments and decisions made with reference to the sheep opinion will also be applied to the pig opinion where appropriate. Pre-journey fasting including hazards and the preventive measures, conclusions and recommendations were presented. This Scientific Opinion is due for adoption at the end of June 2022.



7. New mandates

7.1 Request for a scientific opinion concerning the use of high-expansion foam for stunning and killing of pigs and poultry

A new mandate was received from the EC in order to evaluate and assess the use of high-expansion foam and to add this method in Annex I of the Council Regulation No 1099/2009. The terms of reference were presented, and further steps discussed with the AHAW Panel. Candidates for chairing the Working group could volunteer and inform the animal welfare team leader. Chair and composition of the working group will be identified and agreed during summer 2022.

8. Other topics for information and/or discussion

N/A

9. Any other business

N/A