



EUROPEAN COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HEALTH AND FOOD SAFETY

Health and food audits and analysis

DG(SANTE) 2019-6898

FINAL REPORT OF AN AUDIT  
CARRIED OUT IN  
ROMANIA  
FROM 30 SEPTEMBER 2019 TO 02 OCTOBER 2019  
IN ORDER TO  
EVALUATE ANIMAL WELFARE DURING TRANSPORT BY LIVESTOCK VESSEL  
TO NON-EU COUNTRIES

### ***Executive summary***

*This audit took place in Romania from 30 September to 2 October 2019 to evaluate the suitability and effectiveness of the measures in place to prevent animals being transported in a way likely to cause injury or undue suffering during transport by sea to non-EU countries.*

*The report concludes that the central competent authority has not provided sufficient information, instructions or access to suitably qualified staff to support official veterinarians in checking the technical requirements, such as air changes per hour on each deck of a livestock vessel, and the equipment used for watering and drainage systems, including alternative equipment. Consequently, the system of inspection of vessels does not contribute significantly to decreasing risks for the welfare of the animals due to structural conditions of the vessels.*

*There is also a general lack of records in the system of controls to ensure animal welfare during transport by sea to non-EU countries. There is no evidence of checks confirming that the animals are fit to continue the journey, or of the adequacy of the vessels' drainage systems. Furthermore, there is no supporting documentary evidence as to the suitability of the vessels' other on-board systems.*

*The absence of documented procedures, records and support to official veterinarians in checking vessels provide little assurances on the effectiveness of most controls carried out.*

*In the few instances where the documented procedures are complete and technical support is not required, official veterinarians generally carry out their control tasks and document the outcome.*

*There are resting facilities in the port should there be a delay in loading the animals into the vessel. For large number of animals for larger vessels, the authorities can count on the close vicinity of several holdings to accommodate all the animals if needed.*

*Romania has approved more than 50% of livestock vessels operating in the EU. Giving the poor quality of the checks and records, there is a distinct possibility that animal welfare issues arise during sea transport on board these vessels, although it will ultimately depend on the thoroughness of controls carried out at the port prior to loading. When these vessels depart from Romania, the animals' welfare depends primarily on the organiser's choice of a good quality vessel rather than on official controls, as these provide little added value in terms of guarantee that animals will be spared unnecessary suffering during the journey by sea due to structural conditions of the vessels.*

*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	Information, instructions and support for staff carrying out controls .....	3
5.2	Transport conditions on arrival at the port .....	4
5.3	Facilities at the port .....	5
5.4	Delays at the border .....	5
5.5	Welfare of animals during sea transport .....	6
6	Overall conclusions .....	9
7	Closing meeting .....	10
8	Recommendations .....	10

## ABBREVIATIONS AND DEFINITIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
ANSVSA	the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority ( <i>Autoritatea Națională Sanitară Veterinară și pentru Siguranța Alimentelor</i> )
CSVFSD	the Country Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Directorate responsible for the port
EU	European Union
Port inspectors	official veterinarians working at the border inspection point of the port
Traces	the Commission's Trade Control and Expert System (the integrated computerised veterinary system provided for in Decision 2003/24/EC)

## **1 INTRODUCTION**

This audit took place in Romania from 30 September to 02 October 2019 and was not in the planned audit programme. An opening meeting was held with the competent authorities on 30 September 2019. 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 a national expert from an EU Member State and was accompanied throughout the audit by representatives from the competent authority, the National Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Authority (*Autoritatea Națională Sanitară Veterinară și pentru Siguranța Alimentelor* – ANSVSA).

## **2 OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE**

The objective of the audit was to evaluate the suitability and effectiveness of the measures in place to prevent animals being transported in a way likely to cause injury or undue suffering during transport by sea 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: approval and inspections of livestock vessels, checks of vehicles and animals on arrival at ports, arrangements at the exit point to give priority to the transport of animals and, where necessary, to care for the animals. The scope also included actions taken when non-compliances were identified on the above control activities. Official controls included were those on the welfare of ruminants (cattle, sheep and goats) during export by livestock vessel to non-EU countries. The audit covered the period from January 2015 to April 2018.

The main legal requirements are included in:

- Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations (hereafter: "the Regulation");
- 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.

Commission Decision 2004/292/EC was included in relation to entering data from checks into the Commission's Trade Control and Expert System (Traces). In pursuit of the objectives, the following meetings were held:

Meetings / visits			Comments
Competent authority	Central	2	Opening and closing meetings
	Other	3	Meetings over three days with the competent authority representatives carrying out animal welfare controls at a port of exit. These included meetings with representatives of the Maritime Agency and shipping agents.
Site visits		1	Visits to two operators at a port of exit.

### 3 LEGAL BASIS

The audit was carried out under the general provisions of EU legislation and in particular Article 28 of the Regulation, and Article 45 of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.

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

### 4 BACKGROUND

In March 2019 the Commission was informed that Romania intended to export 66,000 sheep to the Middle East in July 2019. The Commissioner for DG Health and Food Safety wrote to the Romanian Minister of Agriculture asking that this export does not go ahead because of the expected extreme temperatures during the journey. The animals were exported as originally planned.

This audit was added to DG Health and Food Safety's project on Member States' controls of animal welfare during export to non-EU countries. It is the fourth audit on exports by sea. The Commission will share the outcomes from this project with all Member States to help the uniform application of the Regulation.

In 2015, DG Health and Food Safety published an overview report DG(SANCO)/2014-7350 on study visits to improve Member State controls on animal welfare during transport: [http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/overview\\_reports/details.cfm?rep\\_id=72](http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/overview_reports/details.cfm?rep_id=72)

The Member States Network of National Contact Points on animal welfare during transport developed and agreed a reference document<sup>(1)</sup> intended for authorities approving livestock vessels and when inspecting the loading of vessels. Although this document does not constitute an audit standard and is not legally binding, it does provide expert opinion and guidance on implementing the legal requirements in this area.

There are two EU exit points in Romania where animals are transferred onto livestock vessels. Regarding the numbers of animals exported from Romania, 83,982 cattle and 1,254,536 sheep arrived by road to the ports in 2018, and were transferred to livestock vessels making up 202 shipments to non-EU countries last year, mainly to Jordan and Libya, but also

---

<sup>(1)</sup> The network document on livestock vessels, last revised in 2014, is available in five languages (EN, FR, ES, HR, RO and SI), which are also the main Member States with experts involved in drafting the document. It is publicly accessible at: <https://circabc.europa.eu>

to Israel, Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq and Saudi Arabia. The vast majority of Romanian live animal exports (96%) depart from one of the two ports. The authority in this port is also responsible for the approval of 43 of the 79 (56%) livestock vessels approved by the Member States. Most animals exported from these ports are of Romanian origin.

The country profile of Romania 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=RO](http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/country_profiles/details.cfm?co_id=RO)

A previous fact-finding mission on animal welfare during sea transport was carried out in Romania in 2015 (report reference number: DG(SANCO)/2015-7425, hereafter "report 2015/7425"). The report is accessible at:

[http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/audit\\_reports/index.cfm](http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/audit_reports/index.cfm)

## **5 FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**

### **5.1 INFORMATION, INSTRUCTIONS AND SUPPORT FOR STAFF CARRYING OUT CONTROLS**

#### **Legal requirements**

Article 4(2)(a) and (4), and Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004

Articles 21, 22 and 23 of the Regulation

#### **Findings**

1. The documented procedure for the inspection of a livestock vessel prior to approval is substantially a checklist which is part of Order 16/2010. This checklist covers all points included under Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation, with the exception of drainage systems (Point 5).
2. The documented procedure for the inspection of a livestock vessel prior to loading animals is substantially in the form of another checklist:
  - As already described in report 2015/7425, this checklist includes instructions to calculate and record the minimum required quantities of water and feed and available stocking density on board the vessel in order to verify compliance with these three requirements (see also paragraph 27).
  - This checklist was last modified after July 2018 in response to the follow-up action by the Commission's auditing services on a vessel which was seen during the audit to Slovenia to evaluate animal welfare during transport to non-EU countries (report DG(SANTE)2018-6449, hereafter "report 2018/6449"). That vessel had also operated through Romanian ports prior to the audit to Slovenia. As indicated in report 2018/6449, that vessel was deficient regarding several provisions of Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation. The Commission services had pointed out that the checklist used by the Romanian competent authorities did not include points on drainage, lighting, or alarm systems.
  - This checklist now covers all points required by Article 20 and Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation with the exception of drainage systems.

3. There is no documentary guidance or instructions explaining how to verify compliance with specific technical requirements which are not of a veterinary nature, e.g. ventilation capacity, functioning of emergency systems, and water and drainage pumps.
4. A national procedure requires exporters to notify the official veterinarians at the border inspection post of the port of exit (hereafter "port inspectors") of their intention to export animals by livestock vessel four days in advance. ANSVSA indicated that this is the time needed to carry out the necessary documentary animal health and welfare checks when the animals are intended for export to countries with detailed animal health requirements. Point 3(b) of Annex II to the Regulation requires prior notification of minimum two working days.
5. According to a national instruction, a journey log needs to be completed from the place of origin (generally an assembly centre) until the place of final destination in the non-EU country. This is in accordance with the requirements of the Regulation, and has been confirmed in a judgement of the European Court of Justice in 2017<sup>(2)</sup>.
6. ANSVSA has drafted a new order to improve the system for the approval of livestock vessels. Under this draft order, livestock vessels will be inspected by veterinary and maritime safety authorities and will be approved for maximum three years instead of the current five. A draft cooperation protocol has also been prepared. The intention to establish such a protocol had already been initiated four years ago, and has been mentioned in report 2015/7425.
7. ANSVSA is drafting a checklist for the inspection of vehicles arriving at the port. This document has not been finalised yet.

## **5.2 TRANSPORT CONDITIONS ON ARRIVAL AT THE PORT**

8. ANSVSA indicated that port inspectors check all livestock vehicles arriving at the ports but those checks are not being recorded. This is not in compliance with the requirements of Article 9(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.
9. For vehicles which travel long road journeys before reaching the port, checks on journey logs include checks that a livestock vessel and a transporter for the sea journey have been identified. The port inspectors indicated that these are generally absent for those few journeys starting in Hungary (only 13 consignments in 2018). Although they are aware of these non-compliances, the port inspectors did not reported any non-compliance to their national contact point for informing the departing authority. Instead, they reported the results of the checks as 'satisfactory' in Traces.
10. Both the port inspectors and representatives from the Country Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Directorate responsible for the port (CSVFSD) indicated that animals of Romanian origin depart from establishments situated throughout Romania. Several large

---

<sup>(2)</sup> Judgement of the European Court of Justice (Third Chamber) of 19 October 2017 – Case C-383/16.

assembly centres were located close to the port, some of which were as close as 30 minutes' distance.

11. Both the port inspectors and the logistics operators indicated that in the last three years there were no cases of unfit animals arriving at the port. In the previous twelve months one dead animal arrived at the port. The absence of records of these controls raises some doubts on the accuracy of these statements. While many animals start their journey in close proximity of the port, the sheer number of animals transiting annually through this port is very high.

### **5.3 FACILITIES AT THE PORT**

12. The unloading facilities at the port are satisfactory and allow checks on fitness of animals to be carried out before continuing the journey. Handlers were employed by logistics operators and trained by private veterinarians.
13. Resting facilities in the port visited are suitable to accommodate the types of animals that transit. These facilities have only been used three times in the past according to the logistics operators and the port inspectors.

### **5.4 DELAYS AT THE BORDER**

14. The resting facilities at the port have insufficient capacity to accommodate the number of animals needed to fill the larger vessels in case of a delay. The port inspectors and the CSVFSD indicated that:
  - co-ordination of the arrival of animals departing from Romania takes place so that this has not been a problem;
  - in the eventuality that the loading of a vessel is refused or delayed for more than two hours, the animals are sent back to the places of departure or other assembly centres in the vicinity of the port;
  - no vessel has been refused loading in the past three years.
15. Details included in the four-day pre-notification document submitted by the organisers are: the name of the vessel and its approval number, the number of animals to be loaded onto the vessel and the intended date of loading. The competent authority indicated that this is used to ensure that arrival of the animals and the vessels at this busy port is properly organised. However none of the pre-notification documents seen by the audit team bore the date of notification and the competent authority could not provide evidence of when any of the pre-notifications had been submitted.

### **Conclusions on welfare of the animals arriving at the port**

16. Port inspectors are aware of the official controls they are required to do, but the absence of any records for these checks and for any subsequent action that might have been taken does not make it possible to verify whether they were in fact performed, their quality or

effectiveness.

17. The fact that deficiencies that port inspectors declare they detect are not recorded in Traces, nor transmitted to the national contact point, results in systematic unreported non-compliances to the Member State of departure concerned which, consequently, cannot take the necessary action to correct these issues.
18. The request to organisers to notify well in advance the planned loading of a vessel enables port inspectors to better organise their resources and gives them sufficient time to verify, amongst other things, that the loading is adequately planned with the arrival of the vessel to avoid the risk of unnecessary delays at the port during loading. The absence of records makes it impossible to verify that this procedure is being properly implemented and that, consequently, this risk is being avoided.
19. The facilities available in the port and its vicinity would allow the authorities – in case of delays in the loading of the vessels – to accommodate the animals and avoid welfare risks in those situations.

## **5.5 WELFARE OF ANIMALS DURING SEA TRANSPORT**

### **Legal requirements**

Articles 3, 7(2), 19 and 20 of the Regulation

### **Findings**

20. As part of the livestock vessel approval, the transporter responsible for the vessel has to be established in an EU member state. In the case that the applicant is established in a non-EU country, the competent authority requires that the applicant is represented by a shipping agent established in Romania (Article 10(1) of the Regulation).
21. CSVFSD official veterinarians are responsible for inspecting and approving livestock vessels. Procedures require that the transporter applying for the approval of a vessel submits all "relevant documents":
  - The official veterinarians were not sure what "relevant documents" they had to collect in order to verify compliance with each of the technical requirements of Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation. There is no guidance or pre-established list explaining what should be included in the "relevant documents".
  - Only one of the application files reviewed by the audit team had supporting documents for all the technical requirements indicated in Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation. This vessel had previously been authorised to transport animals by a non-EU country which has similar animal welfare standards.

- All application files had deck plans, and water and drainage circuit plans. The official veterinarians used the deck plans to calculate the maximum surface area available to load animals in each deck (Chapter VII of Annex I to the Regulation).
  - Only one of the application files reviewed by the audit team included the certification of the ventilation capacity for the entire ventilation system. In one application file there was no accompanying documentation certifying the air exchanges supplied by the ventilation systems. In another application file this certification was provided for only two of the ventilation fans.
22. The CSVFSD only refused a livestock vessel approval once on first inspection. The reason for refusal was missing and broken portable drinkers. The vessel was approved after this non-compliance was remedied.
23. Procedures for the approval of livestock vessels do not explain how to verify compliance with the specific technical requirements of the vessel, in particular ventilation, drainage and watering systems:
- All approval records indicated that the vessel had been checked for, and complied with, the minimum air changes per hour of forced ventilation systems in each deck, as required by Point 2 of Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation. There was however no documentation to support this decision. The official veterinarians could not explain how they calculated the ventilation capacity on each deck without this documentation.
  - All approval records indicated that the vessel had been checked for, and complied with, the requirement of Point 4 of Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation, namely that the freshwater system was capable of continuously supplying water to the animals on each deck and that alternative pumping equipment was available. In each file the supporting documentation available was plans of the water circuit. The official veterinarians however could not properly read these plans (one-way valves, backup generators) nor explain how the watering system was structured and how it worked.
  - Although the approval checklist does not cover the requirements for drainage systems (see also paragraph 2), the official veterinarians indicated that they nonetheless carry out this check against Point 5 of Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation, i.e. that the drainage system was of appropriate capacity to drain fluids from the pens, that wells or tanks from where sewage is discharged were equipped with pumps or ejectors and that alternative pumping equipment was available. However they could not properly read the plans of the drainage circuits (one-way valves, wells and tanks, pumps and backup pumps) nor explain how the drainage system was structured and how it worked.
  - The official veterinarians acknowledged that they do not have the technical competence to verify most of these requirements.

24. Port inspectors inspect vessels prior to loading animals. Procedures for this control, to verify that the equipment referred to in Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation is in good working order, do not provide the port inspectors with guidance on how to physically carry out these controls (e.g. how to verify that drainage tanks from where sewage is discharged are functioning properly).
25. There were no records indicating non-compliances for any of the vessels which loaded at these ports in the last three years. According to the port inspectors, they detected some minor issues and these were corrected on the spot but not recorded.
26. All pre-loading checklists seen by the audit team indicated that the vessels inspected complied with the requirements of Section 1 of Chapter IV of Annex I to the Regulation, with the exception of the missing check for drainage systems (see also paragraph 1). The port inspectors were however unable to explain how they verify that certain systems and the relevant equipment (forced ventilation systems, drainage systems and pumps, alarms, back-up generators, etc.) are in good working order.
27. All pre-loading inspection checklists included the calculation of minimum feed and water required for the animals throughout the journey and of the stocking density to verify compliance with the requirements in Section 2 of Chapter IV of Annex I and Chapter VII of Annex I to the Regulation.
28. Eight vessels called in the port visited by the audit team a week before the audit, and six of them loaded animals. The audit plan envisaged that the audit team witnesses an inspection of a livestock vessel, but no livestock vessels called at Romanian ports during the week of the audit.
29. It takes between 40 minutes and one hour for Customs and Immigration authorities and the harbour master to inspect a vessel on entry into the port visited.
30. According to the shipping agents, six hours are required to load between 5,000 and 6,000 sheep or 600 to 700 cattle.
31. Of the six vessels that loaded animals the previous week, one entered and left the port in eight hours, and it loaded 5,000 sheep and 580 cattle. This indicates that the animals were loaded in seven hours and probably the port inspectors had little time to inspect the vessel. The other five vessels were moored at the docks for a sufficient period that would in principle enable the port inspectors to carry out proper controls.

### **Conclusions on welfare of animals during sea transport**

32. The insufficient information and instructions for port inspectors together with the absence of suitably qualified staff for assessing technical requirements for livestock vessels translates into a poor evaluation of technical requirements (such as air changes per hour on each deck of a livestock vessel, and the equipment used for watering and drainage systems on board a livestock vessel) during the approval and inspection before

loading. Therefore, official controls do not contribute to minimise the animal welfare risk linked to facilities and equipment.

33. Procedures include the relevant legal requirements but do not provide instructions for CSVFSD official veterinarians and port inspectors on how to verify these requirements as part of a practical inspection of a livestock vessel. Inspections of livestock vessels are therefore dependant on the experience of the inspectors, but not all requirements are adequately verified, which could have major implications for animal welfare during sea journeys.

34. The inadequacies in the inspections carried out on vessels loading in Romania and in their livestock vessel approval procedure pose a risk to animal welfare. There is a distinct possibility that animal welfare issues arise from the inadequacies in the inspections as the competent authority has approved more than 50% of livestock vessels operating in the EU and inspects most of them several times each year.

## 6 OVERALL CONCLUSIONS

Documented procedures include most relevant legal requirements, with the exception of drainage systems, but do not provide instructions on how to verify these requirements as part of a practical inspection of a livestock vessel. In addition, ANSVSA has not provided sufficient information, instructions or access to suitably qualified staff to support official veterinarians in checking the technical requirements of the Regulation, such as air changes per hour on each deck of a livestock vessel, and the equipment used for watering and drainage systems on board a livestock vessel, including alternative equipment. Consequently, the system of inspection of vessels does not contribute significantly to decrease the risk for the welfare of the animals which derive from structural conditions of the vessels.

There is also a general lack of records in the system of controls to ensure animal welfare during transport by sea to non-EU countries. This includes evidence for: checks on vehicles and animals arriving at the port and the animals' suitability to continue the journey, any non-compliance detected during these checks, checks on the vessels' drainage systems at the moment of approval and prior to loading animals, and supporting documentary evidence on the suitability of the vessels' other on-board systems with the technical requirements of the Regulation. In those few instances where the documented procedures are complete and technical support is not required, official veterinarians generally carry out their control tasks and document the outcome.

The absence of documented procedures, records and support to official veterinarians in checking vessels provide little assurances on the effectiveness of most controls carried out.

Furthermore, deficiencies that port inspectors declare they detect are not being recorded in Traces nor transmitted to the national contact point. These systematic non-compliances are thus not reported to the Member State of departure concerned which consequently, cannot

take the necessary action to correct these issues.

In case of a delay in loading the animals into the vessel, there are resting facilities in the port. In case of large number of animals for larger vessels, the authorities can count on the close vicinity with several holdings to accommodate all the animals in case of need.

Romania has approved more than 50% of livestock vessels operating in the EU. Given the poor quality of the checks and records, there is a possibility that animal welfare issues arise during sea transport on board these vessels, although it will ultimately depend on the thoroughness of controls carried out at the port prior to loading. When these vessels depart from Romania, the animals' welfare depends primarily on the organiser's choice of a good quality vessel rather than on official controls, as these provide little added value to guarantee that animals will be spared unnecessary suffering during the journey by sea due to structural conditions.

## 7 CLOSING MEETING

A closing meeting was held on 2 October 2019 with representatives of the competent authorities, at which the main findings and preliminary conclusions of the audit were presented by the audit team.

The competent authority's representatives indicated that they have the firm intention to improve the conditions for animal welfare during export activities by sea.

## 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:

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>1.</b>	The competent authority should provide sufficient information and instructions for staff, as required by Article 8(1) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, to carry out official controls at the port, including inspections carried out according to Articles 19, 20 and 21 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.  Recommendation based on conclusions: 16, 32 and 33.  Associated findings: 1, 2, 3, 7, 21, 23, 24 and 26.
<b>2.</b>	The competent authority should take measures to ensure that they have access to suitably qualified staff, as required by Article 4(2)(c) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, when carrying out inspections according to Articles 19 and 20 of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005, in particular on the technical requirements listed in

<b>No.</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
	<p>Section I of Chapter IV of Annex I to Regulation (EC) No 1/2005.</p> <p>Recommendation based on conclusion: 32.</p> <p>Associated findings: 3, 6, 21, 23, 24 and 26.</p>
<p><b>3.</b></p>	<p>The competent authority should take measures to ensure that reports of the official controls carried out at the port:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• on incoming vehicles and accompanying journey logs for the purposes of Article 21(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1/2005; and</li> <li>• for the purposes of Article 21(1)(a),(b) and (c), in particular that the animals are fit to continue their journey;</li> </ul> <p>are drawn up and their results properly recorded, as required by Articles 9(1) and 9(2) of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004.</p> <p>Recommendation based on conclusion: 16 and 17.</p> <p>Associated findings: 7, 8 and 9.</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=2019-6898](http://ec.europa.eu/food/audits-analysis/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2019-6898)

## ANNEX 1 – LEGAL REFERENCES

<b>Legal Reference</b>	<b>Official Journal</b>	<b>Title</b>
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
Dec. 2004/292/EC	OJ L 94, 31.3.2004, p. 63-64	2004/292/EC: Commission Decision of 30 March 2004 on the introduction of the Traces system and amending Decision 92/486/EEC