

## Executive Summary

### 1.1 This report presents the findings of the Evaluation of the EU Policy on Animal Welfare (EUPAW) and Possible Options for the Future.

The evaluation was commissioned by the Directorate General for Health and Consumers (DG SANCO) of the European Commission under the terms of the framework contract between GHK Consulting and DG SANCO. The overall aim of the assignment is to provide an independent evaluation of the EUPAW and an assessment of the possible options for the future. More specifically the objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Undertake an analysis of the results of the EUPAW and a comparison with its objectives;
- Assess the efficiency of the policy in meeting these objectives and its coherence with other areas of EU policy;
- Establish whether changes are needed to the EUPAW and suggest possible improvements to the scope, structure and working practices, having considered different policy options; and
- Make recommendations for the design of future policy, taking into account socio-economic issues.

This final report details the work undertaken for the evaluation and presents the answers to the eleven evaluation questions set out in the project specification. The analysis is based on four primary research activities - an online stakeholder consultation, interviews with stakeholders and policy makers, national missions to selected Member States and a review of documents and data.

#### 1.1.1 EU animal welfare legislation has improved the welfare of many of Europe's farm and experimental animals, but more could be achieved with stronger and more consistent enforcement of existing rules.

EU legislation has improved the welfare conditions for those groups of animals that are covered by targeted legislation, such as pigs, calves, laying hens, animals during transport and experimental animals. In order to be effective in achieving higher standards of welfare, legislative tools have to contain detailed requirements and cover all aspects of welfare. For zoo animals, EU legislation aims at biodiversity conservation and does not specifically refer to animal welfare. Welfare could be improved by providing more detailed requirements for the needs of wild animals.

Enforcement procedures are in place, both in Member States and at EU level. The systems appear to be functioning, but variations in enforcement undermine progress towards uniformly high standards across the EU. There is potential to achieve much higher standards of animal welfare by strengthening the enforcement of current EU legislation. The welfare assessment protocols developed in the EU funded Welfare Quality® project could be adapted for enforcement.

By extending the scope of EU welfare legislation, several other groups of animals could benefit from higher welfare standards. This can be achieved either through laws targeted at particular groups of animals or through a general EU animal welfare law. Non-legislative routes can also be utilised.

#### 1.1.2 EU legislation to protect animals has, in general, helped to reduce competitive distortions in the internal market caused by differences in national standards, but in certain areas further action on enforcement and harmonisation is required.

EU legislation on the protection of animals has contributed to, but not fully ensured, the proper functioning of the internal market for the economic activities affected. In those areas

where specific EU animal welfare legislation is in place, it has made progress in harmonising standards of animal welfare across the EU. Without it, standards would undoubtedly be lower than they are today in some Member States, and higher in others. Much greater variations in standards exist for those animals outside the scope of current EU legislation, such as dairy cows and pets. These groups of animals would benefit from harmonised EU legislation to achieve higher standards of welfare.

Harmonisation is seen as important by Member States and stakeholders in avoiding competitive distortions within the internal market. Although animal welfare standards are only one factor affecting patterns of production and trade, there is evidence that they can have an impact.

Despite the progress made, there is more to do – the harmonisation effort is still work in progress. A lack of clarity in the EU standards has become a barrier to effective harmonisation in some areas. Some Member States have implemented standards that go beyond those set by EU law. Most importantly, there are variations in enforcement which mean that the effective harmonisation is less than is suggested by an analysis of the standards laid down in law.

### 1.1.3 EU funding for research and scientific advice on animal welfare has made a positive contribution to policy.

About €15 million of EU funding was allocated to scientific research on animal welfare in each year of the evaluation period. For EU Framework Programme 6 projects, this only represented about 0.5% of the total FP6 budget. The focus of most of the EU welfare research funding is on farm animals and the development of techniques that facilitate the replacement of in vivo animal testing, reflecting the priorities of EU animal welfare legislation.

Only a very small amount of money has been spent on refinement of animal experiments, despite the potential to improve welfare through this type of research. There is a need for scientific data with regard to the welfare of wild animals in captivity as this has also attracted minimal research funding thus far. There are some examples of different Member States funding research into similar animal welfare issues, suggesting there are potential benefits from better coordination at EU level.

There are concerns that the FP7 Ethics Review process (concerning the ethical discussion of research proposals) does not meet its objectives. Information from EU research projects is linked with EU policy, primarily via EFSA activities. There is less evidence of research informing communication actions and international activities.

### 1.1.4 It is not possible to determine the extent to which EU communication actions have raised stakeholder and public awareness and responsibility towards animal welfare, but there has been a high level of public engagement in consultations linked to animal welfare legislation.

The EU has supported events, online resources and policy consultations. Surveys suggest that there is significant public interest in animal welfare issues and there were high levels of public engagement in EU consultations linked to reviews of legislation. However, partly as a result of a lack of monitoring information, there is little evidence from which to determine the impact of EU communications on stakeholders' and public awareness and responsibility towards animal welfare.

The size of the communications task is large, given the number of consumers and stakeholders and their current levels of awareness, and EU resources are limited. This calls for a strategic approach which focuses effort on areas and issues where EU communication efforts can deliver most added-value. A variety of different organisations are involved in communications activities at different levels and to different audiences, and the European Commission's role needs to be defined within this landscape. An animal welfare communications strategy, identifying the priorities for targeting the EU's limited resources,

would help to focus activity and resources to maximise impact. Stronger monitoring systems would enable the impact of investments in communication activities to be better assessed.

**1.1.5 The EU's international initiatives have helped to raise awareness and create a shared international understanding of animal welfare issues and standards, particularly with trading partners in markets for food products, but there is much more to do.**

The EU first raised animal welfare within the WTO in 2000, an action that led to animal welfare being identified as a priority in the Strategic Plan of the OIE in 2001. This was a starting point for activity in this area in third countries, although mainly focused on food producing animals. At the start of the evaluation period, very few third countries had animal welfare codes and many were unaware of the importance of animal welfare to the EU.

To raise awareness of animal welfare at the global level, the EU has contributed to the work of intergovernmental organisations, such as the OIE and FAO, provided training for scientists, government officials, farm workers and veterinary officers and included animal welfare in trade agreements with third countries.

The international activities of the EU are widely welcomed by third countries and are recognised as having raised the profile and awareness of animal welfare in a global context, but there is still much to be achieved. There is widespread support by EU citizens and stakeholders that this should continue to be a priority area for the EU.

**1.1.6 The establishment of equivalent market conditions between EU businesses and those from third countries exporting to the EU is a long term project on which the Commission has been working via bilateral and multilateral channels; foundations are being laid but there is more to do.**

There are significant differences between the legislation, voluntary standards and public perceptions of animal welfare in the countries exporting to the EU and those within the EU. The differences are most pronounced where EU Directives are in place for particular species of farm animals. At present, lower production costs in third countries generally owe more to differences in labour, feed and other costs, than to different animal welfare standards.

There is a significant risk that higher egg production costs in the EU from 2012 will further weaken the competitive position of the industry compared to third country producers and that this will impact on international trade in future, particularly for egg products. A European Parliament Resolution on the Animal Welfare Action Plan called for imports of eggs into the EU to comply with the same conditions as those of the EU, and for this to apply equally to shell eggs and egg products.

The EU has been working via the OIE and bilaterally with trading partners to raise awareness of animal welfare aimed at lifting standards in other countries in order to have common rules. This remains work in progress. The OIE only began its role in animal welfare in 2001 and, by the end of 2004, guiding principles for animal welfare had been established, based on internationally-recognised terms such as the Five Freedoms and the Three Rs. OIE recommendations for international transport and slaughter, adopted in 2005, appear to have been influenced by EU requirements. On-farm animal welfare is now beginning to be addressed by the OIE but this will be a long-term issue. Bilateral agreements with the EU's main current and prospective trading partners will therefore remain important for the future.

Implementation and enforcement of international standards are not directly within the OIE's responsibilities. These are likely to remain important challenges for the future. It is clear that the EU has played a significant role in the OIE's animal welfare activities to date and also in the development of bilateral agreements but the extent of its contribution may be underestimated at present by some stakeholders in the EU. Continued EU initiatives will be needed if progress is to be maintained at international level.

1.1.7 The financial resources and instruments at EU level have grown to meet the increasing resource needs of the EUPAW, and there will be a need for further increases in funding as the policy continues to develop in the years ahead.

Financial resources devoted to the development and implementation of animal welfare policy at EU level are modest but increasing. Funds have grown to meet the increasing resource needs of the policy, but further growth will be needed as the policy develops further. The FVO would benefit from more resources for inspection efforts. Provision of more dedicated resources for animal welfare would provide greater certainty and reduce the administrative effort needed to secure the funds necessary to deliver the policy.

Substantial funding related to animal welfare is provided to third parties through the EU schemes financed by the European Agricultural Guarantee Fund (EAGF), the European Agricultural Fund for Rural Development (EAFRD) and the budget for the Framework Programme for Research. The most relevant schemes are the EU rural development programmes, research Framework Programmes and budgets for the so-called "veterinary fund". The impact of these schemes in contributing to animal welfare policy is significant but variable. The evaluation suggests that increasing the benefits of existing instruments for animal welfare, rather than developing new ones, is the main priority.

At the Member State level, substantial resources are devoted to the implementation and enforcement of EU animal welfare policy, especially for farm animals. Total Member States' expenditures in this area greatly exceed those made at EU level. There are also significant budgets for animal welfare research at EU and Member State level.

1.1.8 EU animal welfare policy appears to have succeeded in striking a balance between the varied needs and expectations of citizens, industry and other groups on an issue for which ambitions differ across Europe. There are widespread calls for more consistent enforcement but less appetite for a new wave of standards, suggesting an agenda defined by evolution rather than revolution for the next few years.

EU citizens and stakeholders have diverse needs and expectations from animal welfare and attach varying emphasis to different aspects of the EUPAW. Some stakeholders would like the policy to be more ambitious in its scope and objectives, while others argue that EU policies are already too onerous. Evidence suggests general public support for the EU's approach to improving the welfare of farm and experimental animals. There is no compelling case for changing the general direction of policy.

The study has reaffirmed the basic principles (e.g. the need for policy to be clear, enforceable and based on sound science and economics) and identified priorities (the need for better enforcement of existing legislation) for the policy framework in the years ahead. The interests of different groups will need to be balanced as the policy develops and inclusive processes for stakeholder engagement will continue to be needed to ensure these different needs and interests are heard and taken into account.

1.1.9 The various components of EU animal welfare policy are broadly complementary, mutually supportive and consistent, and have (thus far) avoided major conflict with other EU policies, such as on competitiveness, trade and environment.

The different elements of the EUPAW are broadly internally consistent and coherent with other areas of EU policy. No major areas of conflict have been identified, although a few specific examples of tensions between the EUPAW and other policies can be identified. There are potentially some general trade-offs between animal welfare and other policy goals (such as those of environmental policy), although the specific elements of the EUPAW itself do not appear to conflict with these. There are examples where different elements of the EUPAW (research, legislation, communication and international activities) are mutually supportive, and support other EU policy areas.

- 1.1.10 Some businesses have incurred significant transitional costs as a result of new EU welfare standards but tariffs and other trade barriers have mitigated the extent to which the costs have impacted on EU producers' ongoing competitiveness in domestic markets. There is no evidence that the EUPAW has undermined the economic sustainability of the sectors concerned.

It is widely accepted that animal welfare policies increase the costs of businesses in the farming and experimental sectors. Some estimates of costs are available for individual pieces of legislation, although in some cases the effect of these will be observed after the 2000-2008 period. Higher animal welfare standards also have a variety of business benefits, though these are usually not fully quantified and most estimates suggest that they are outweighed by the costs to the businesses affected.

Overall, the annual business costs of legislation for the farm animal sector are estimated at €2.8 billion and those of the new Experimental Animals Directive at €54 million, though the timing of these costs varies for different items of legislation. These additional costs represent approximately 2% of the value of the overall output of the livestock sector, and 2% of the estimated total cost of experiments using animals.

While estimates of costs are available, there is limited evidence of the economic impact of new EU legislation on the sectors affected, and in particular whether these costs affect economic sustainability by causing a loss of output or employment at EU level. The scale of economic impacts depends on supply and demand conditions, variations in market protection for agricultural products, and the significance of animal welfare compared to other costs and business drivers. While some claims of adverse economic impacts have been made by industry, there is little independent evidence that animal welfare policies have affected the economic sustainability of the sectors concerned.

The fact that EU animal welfare standards are more demanding than those of international competitors means that there is the potential for negative impacts in the future, particularly in sectors serving product markets that are more exposed to competition (e.g. processed egg products) and if further trade liberalisation takes place in agriculture.

- 1.1.11 Management of the EUPAW costs the Member States' public administrations an estimated total of around €105 million a year, with about €53 million on farm inspections, about €0.5 million for regulating welfare of experimental animals and about €13 million for administrative costs.

The cost of inspection activities associated with enforcement of legislation on the welfare of farm animals is borne by Member States. The EUPAW also creates central policy costs for the Competent Authority and in relation to the regulation of the welfare of experimental animals, although this may be partially offset by the imposition of fees. Data submitted by Member States to the Commission indicate some large differences in levels of inspection.

Member States were generally unable to attribute costs to their national administration of the EUPAW. Best estimates have therefore been made, based on reported inspection activities for 2008 and other available information. These indicate that for the 27 Member States, the annual cost of farm inspections could be in the region of €53 million, transport inspections could cost €14-15 million and welfare at slaughter a further €24-25 million, with central costs at €13 million. Inspections in relation to experimental animals are estimated to add a further €0.5 million, bringing the total to around €105 million annually. It is emphasised that differences between Member States and lack of available information make cost estimates very difficult. These figures should therefore be used only as a guide and to indicate the relative significance of different types of costs. The costs of management of the EUPAW at Member State level can be compared with estimates of Commission expenditure on animal welfare policy (approximately € 4 million), with Member States' budget commitments on animal disease eradication and monitoring (€184 million) and on their expenditure on the EU plant health regime, which has been estimated to be near to €60 million.

## Recommendations

### 1.2 The analysis in the report suggests that the issues to be addressed by future policy might include:

#### 1.2.1 Recommendations for Section 1 (Welfare Assessment)

- Increasing levels of enforcement of existing legislation, in order to ensure that it meets its potential to improve welfare conditions. There is a need for more uniformity in enforcement systems across Member States, a more harmonised system of penalties across the EU, clearer legislative requirements where they cause different interpretations for enforcement, and an increased number of missions by the FVO.
- Considering extending the scope of EU welfare legislation to include large groups of animals for which welfare concerns exist. This can be achieved through specific animal legislation or through a general EU animal welfare law, although the legal feasibility of such a proposal would need to be explored. Such a law could contribute to a common understanding of the concept of animal welfare across Europe by imposing a clear 'duty of care' for users and keepers of animals. A general animal welfare law could be designed as a framework law, overarching current specific pieces of legislation, or a basic law setting out general principles, accompanied by guidelines on the care of specific animal groups. Both options would have to be clear enough to be enforceable.
- Exploring non-legislative routes for achieving improved welfare conditions to complement existing legislation, for example by stimulating regulatory or non-regulatory initiatives or agreements between sector bodies, parties in the production and retail chain, civil society and governmental bodies.
- Stimulating further development of the Welfare Quality® project welfare assessment protocols for welfare legislation enforcement.
- Enhancing the effectiveness of zoo animal legislation through better enforcement and by providing more detailed requirements for the needs of the animals under its scope. The EU could play a role in this. However it can also be equally achieved by an exchange of knowledge and expertise between Member States, for example by developing joint guidelines.
- Developing an inspection body to support the enforcement of the revised Experimental Animals Directive, and examining whether the FVO should take up this role.

#### 1.2.2 Recommendations for Section 2 (Harmonisation and Internal Market)

- Enhancing the enforcement of existing legislation, to ensure that the progress made in harmonising legal standards is reflected in more harmonisation of actual standards across the EU.
- Clarification of aspects of legislation which have been interpreted differently between Member States, such as for transport: fitness of animals, rest time for animals and driver training.
- Considering introducing welfare legislation at EU level for dairy cows in order to achieve harmonisation of Member State legislation and to address the range of welfare issues that affect the millions of dairy cows in Europe.
- Considering introducing pet welfare legislation at EU level in order to harmonise the variation in pet welfare legislation across the Member States and to address the range of welfare issues that affect millions of pets in Europe. A starting point could be central registration of the ownership of dogs (dog licensing) and the registration of movements of pets in Europe.

- Enhancing communication amongst Member States, and between Member States and the Commission, regarding progress in implementing and enforcing legislation, in order to promote shared understanding and encourage harmonisation.

### 1.2.3 Recommendations for Section 3 (Research/Science)

- Allocating more EU research funding to the refinement of animal experiments and to zoo animal welfare, as these subjects have so far received little attention. The amount allocated should be in line with policy relevance and be decided with input from main stakeholders.
- Evaluating the effectiveness of the FP7 ethics procedures. Increasing effectiveness may require activities in the areas of training and communication.
- Emphasising the importance of EFSA scientific opinion in the development of policy and legislation as well as raising welfare standards.
- Facilitating improved coordination of animal welfare research between Member States to reduce overlap and enhance use of resources (including animals). This could be one of the roles for a network of European Reference Centres for animal welfare. This could be modelled on the existing network of Community Reference Laboratories in the field of animal health and live animals (CRLs). In 2010, these CRLs received on average € 250,000, but contributions for welfare issues should be dependent on the importance and relevance of each issue for the EU.
- Ensuring that EFSA opinions continue to cover the whole scope of the animal welfare policy area, also including non-food-producing animals.

### 1.2.4 Recommendations for Section 4 (EU Communications)

- Development of an animal welfare communication strategy, incorporating:
  1. Definition of the problem to be addressed (based on a mapping of current and recent activity across the EU and an analysis of existing gaps and needs).
  2. Identification of the target audiences and the means by which EU supported communication activities can influence them, either directly or indirectly through other stakeholders.
  3. Definition of the objectives and key messages of communications activity.
  4. Definition of the European Commission's role and responsibilities, working with and through other stakeholders.
  5. An implementation plan, specifying financial and human resources to be deployed, milestones, targets and monitoring and evaluation procedures.
  6. It is recommended that the strategy prioritises communications focused on the core EU policy areas of animal welfare legislation, research and international activities, as well as animal welfare labelling (which has an important potential role in the internal market and international trade). There is greatest scope for the EU to add value where communications link directly to policy and/or seek to enhance co-ordination of activity by Member States. EU initiatives to communicate directly with the public (e.g. through the online tool "Farmland") have had limited impact and should be less of a priority. Other existing communications activities, such as online communication of EU policy, consultations on policy developments, dissemination of the results of EU funded research, and international conferences and events should continue to remain priorities.
- Stronger and more consistent monitoring and evaluation of communication activity, including consistent and regular measurement of the outputs and outcomes achieved through appropriate indicators.

- Continuing work to examine options for the development of animal welfare labelling and consumer information in the EU, following the Commission's 2009 report on the subject.
- Examining the development of regular publications to raise the profile of animal welfare at EU-level, such as a report on the status of animal welfare in the EU, using existing indicators for monitoring the status of animal welfare. Examples of such publications can be found in Member States. If the idea of a European Network of Reference Centres for the protection of animal welfare (recommended in the Paulsen report) becomes a reality in the future, then such centres could play a role in collating and disseminating such information.

### 1.2.5 Recommendations for Section 5 (International Initiatives)

- See 1.2.6.

### 1.2.6 Recommendations for Sections 5 & 6 (International Initiatives)

- Continuing high priority being given to the inclusion of animal welfare in future WTO discussions and in OIE and FAO initiatives, since the active involvement of the EU appears essential to developing a global consensus.
- Continuing bilateral discussions, which enable more focussed agreements on animal welfare to be reached with current and prospective third country trading partners, and should therefore also be given high priority, in the absence of an agreement at WTO level.
- Assessing ways to assist EU sectors which are most vulnerable to third country imports or to likely loss of market share, due to lower animal welfare requirements, in particular in the eggs and eggs products sector.
- Paying particular attention to ways of encouraging and enforcing the adoption of appropriate animal welfare standards at international level. This could include increased participation of third country representatives in international training initiatives, building on previous success. The feasibility of using internet-based training resources to reduce costs and encourage attendance could be explored. Achieving compliance with OIE standards, particularly in relation to on-farm requirements is likely to become increasingly important in future and EU expertise and resources will need to be allocated in this area for development and implementation. As OIE standards on the farm have not been adopted yet, the development and adoption of those standards should be considered the priority before their enforcement.
- Communicating the role and activities of the EU in international initiatives more clearly to EU stakeholders, since this evaluation has identified that there is a general lack of awareness, except amongst those who are directly involved.
- Reviewing the EU's international activities and evaluating outcomes periodically, to ensure a focus on the most successful strategies.

### 1.2.7 Recommendations for Section 7 (Financial Instruments)

- Ensuring adequate growth in funding for the EUPAW over the next action plan period, in line with the growing needs of the policy, and in order to meet increasing needs identified in this evaluation. These include support for implementation and enforcement of new legislation, increasing international activities, and communications related to EU policy and research. This will be a challenge given budgetary and staffing restrictions and suggests a need to reallocate resources from other policy areas.
- Ensuring that the FVO has sufficient funding for current and future needs to ensure adequate levels of inspection and enforcement effort.

- Examining the need for more dedicated budget lines dedicated to support key aspects of animal welfare policy, to reduce the uncertainty and administrative effort needed to secure the required financial resources, and to fund additional activities which cannot be funded through the current financial framework.
- Ensuring sufficient resources are allocated at EU level to meet the transposition, implementation and monitoring requirements of the revised Experimental Animals Directive.
- Emphasising the importance of the CAP to animal welfare, as part of the current CAP reform debate. Key issues are:
  - The potential to shift funding to the rural development programme, and hence potentially boost resources for animal welfare;
  - Arrangements for funding animal welfare through rural development programmes, and whether they should remain voluntary or whether there is a case for introducing a mandatory element. It is important to consider other priorities for rural development funding, and the respective roles of public funding, markets and private investment in raising animal welfare standards;
  - The role of cross compliance in a reformed CAP, and, if direct payments continue, whether they should be made conditional on a wider range of animal welfare legislation.

#### 1.2.8 Recommendations for Section 8 (Stakeholders & Citizens)

- Developing a stakeholder engagement plan for each aspect of EU animal welfare policy, setting out a structured approach to engaging with stakeholders at each stage of the policy process.
- Establishing working groups bringing together Member State authorities and the Commission to enhance dialogue and share experience regarding the transposition, implementation and enforcement of specific items of legislation.
- Strengthening exchange of information and co-ordination of activity regarding animal welfare research between Member States and the Commission.
- In consultation with stakeholder groups, assessing the need to develop new modes of engagement over time, which might include:
  - Stakeholder platform(s) on animal welfare issues. This would provide a more regular and structured approach to engagement. It could comprise a general forum for engagement on animal welfare policy issues, and/or specific sub-groups for dialogue on particular issues, covering specific items of legislation (e.g. the implementation of new Experimental Animals Directive), providing regular dialogue on future priorities (e.g. priorities for EU funded research) and/or examining emerging issues of policy concern (e.g. companion animals);
  - Online fora on particular issues of animal welfare policy. These may be relatively inexpensive means of encouraging dialogue, but experience suggests that they are unlikely to replace direct contact and need active promotion to be effective;
  - Advisory committees on particular issues, comprising independent experts from academia, business and government policy.

#### 1.2.9 Recommendations for Section 9 (Other EU Policies)

- The analysis suggests that the EUPAW is broadly internally consistent and that there are no major areas of conflict with other policies. The need to address specific areas where there are apparent conflicts, such as between rules for animal transport and driver hours, could be considered.

### 1.2.10 Recommendations for Section 10 (Economic Sustainability)

- Use of rural development programmes to support investment and aid adaptation to higher standards in the farming sector, as well as to reward practices that go beyond minimum standards. The degree to which this is a priority for rural development programmes is a matter for national and regional administrations.
- Designing legislation so as to manage adverse impacts, for example by aligning phase-in periods with capital replacement cycles, and by applying more flexible approaches to setting standards. For example, basing standards on animal welfare outcomes, measured using appropriate indicators, gives more flexibility to businesses in their response, and may contribute to higher welfare outcomes than more rigid, prescriptive rules. However, it is also important to ensure that compliance with standards can be measured and enforced.
- Supporting research and development (through the Framework Programmes and by encouraging co-ordination of initiatives at Member State level) to identify, develop, test and demonstrate methods that deliver animal welfare standards and enhance the economic sustainability of the sectors affected.
- Promoting development and harmonisation of labelling schemes to enhance consumer awareness and confidence. Initiatives in this area could examine more harmonised approaches to labelling of higher welfare, premium products, which currently account for a minor share of overall EU production, with the aim of enhancing demand. They could also investigate opportunities to enhance consumer awareness of animal welfare standards in the wider market.
- Examining the role of public procurement in rewarding high welfare standards.
- Promoting animal welfare policies, practices and reporting in the corporate social responsibility agenda, in order to highlight good practice and promote reputational benefits.
- Further independent research to enhance understanding of the economic impacts of different animal welfare policies. Much of the available evidence focuses on costs, and, while business benefits are frequently documented, they are rarely quantified. Targeted research to quantify the business benefits of animal welfare standards would have clear benefits both in encouraging improvements in practice and in lowering resistance to further development of standards.

### 1.2.11 Recommendations for Section 11 (Member State Administration)

- The research suggests that better communication between the Commission and Member States could be mutually beneficial, in that it would allow more exchange of information on the data supplied and resolve apparent anomalies. It would also help to quantify the main areas of administration costs and identify opportunities for cost reductions.