



Quite a few people have subscribed to this Newsletter. We will send this third letter to over 300 interested scientists, farmers, policy makers and representatives from NGO's... to name but a few.

### Work Package 1- Analysis of Animal Welfare initiatives in Europe

As one of the project's first deliverables we compiled and published a report in which animal welfare promoting standards and initiatives in European countries are listed. With the help of a questionnaire the main goals, the main instruments and the main actors in the selected standards and initiatives were identified. Then, during an expert meeting in Madrid (September 2009), the initiatives were clustered and scored for their expected impact. Altogether 84 initiatives from The Netherlands, Germany, Spain, United Kingdom, Sweden, Italy, Poland and Macedonia were discussed and classified. The result is a very useful electronic database with all kinds of animal welfare enhancing public and private standards and initiatives. This database provides an opportunity to cluster the selected initiatives in relation to certain specific criteria. These criteria can be related to creating welfare awareness, to support farmer skills, to the kind of instruments they mainly use (for instance regulation or information campaigns) or to the type of actors involved (either as a driving force or otherwise).

In general all regulatory initiatives were considered as more successful to improve animal welfare than the non-regulatory initiatives, like education and information initiatives. The organic farming standards schemes had the highest score of all clustered groups with regard to promoting welfare, awareness, generating demand among consumers and inspiring others to develop new animal friendly initiatives. The analysis and assessment of the Animal Welfare initiatives showed that some actor networks are successfully aiming at multiple goals, using different policy instruments by involving broader networks, whereas a majority of initiatives are focussing on single goals using smaller networks.

In the second part of WP1 we analyse the levels of animal welfare standards within the partner countries and a few third countries compared to European welfare legislation. Combined with results of WP2 (see below), we find quite some differences related to the national and regional context, e.g. the level of animal welfare, culture, public awareness and farmers' skills



in a certain country and the kind of policy instruments that are used so far. An optimised dynamic governance model (e.g. an optimised mix of policy instruments) therefore should be tailor-made for the context of a country (and region). The challenge to the next WP's of the EconWelfare project is to discover effective policy instruments that are able to help a certain community (context) to reach the

next level in the hierarchy. As countries are in different states/levels of welfare development, we will need varying policy instruments to realise these improvements. The knowledge generated in WP1 provides important input for the next work packages.

Otto Schmid  
FiBL - Switzerland

## Picking up momentum

With the first Work Package nearly finished, and the second one well on its way, the project is really picking up momentum. In this Newsletter you will read about some of the results we have obtained in these Work Packages, and also about the plans for the next few months.

Some of them have contacted us over the previous months with questions on the project. One which has been asked a few times is whether EconWelfare deals with only the economics of farm animal welfare. The answer is 'No': the project aims to develop policy options to improve animal welfare, and will try to estimate the consequences of certain options on farm economics, but also on the dynamics in the food chain, on labour requirements, on the animal itself, et cetera. We've also been asked if we only aim for policies to be used by the Commission. Well, there is no doubt that a large proportion of it should be useable by EU policy workers. However, we envisage that in the end our suggestions will be oriented more towards different European regions – rather than to a specific group of users. These sets of options could then be taken up by relevant stakeholders in a given EU region, for each to be used in their own organization (government, retail, education...).

But there's a lot of work to be done before we are at that point. Please let us know if you want to contribute to these discussions in any way.

In the meantime, we will try to keep the momentum going!

Kind regards,

Hans Spoolder  
EconWelfare coordinator

*Expert meeting Madrid*



## Work Package 2 - Stakeholder analysis of strengths and weaknesses of current standards and initiatives

At the beginning of February we finished a report on the strengths and weaknesses of animal welfare schemes and national legislations which go beyond the EU minimum. The strengths and weaknesses have been evaluated according to the "animal" point of view, using a comprehensive collection of scientific literature. The aim was to assess which technical aspects of the schemes are crucial and essential for a significant increase of animal welfare. After a reordering of the aspects according to the Welfare Quality principles and criteria, the scientist's points of view were used to evaluate the schemes and legislations. A chapter was dedicated to each animal species, and a distinction made between organic schemes and non-organic schemes. Several schemes are related to different species, but were evaluated for each species separately. According to the literature consulted and in the scientists in the expert meeting held in September, the schemes investigated show several weaknesses. For example for pigs, obligatory facilities to avoid competition for feed and water are often lacking in the schemes. As cattle is concerned most schemes correctly stress the necessity of sufficient roughage in the feed ration, but they do not pay much attention to adequate drinking before cattle are being transported. For laying hens most schemes foresee a higher space allowance than the EU minimum, but do not contain prescriptions for micro climate control, which has been indicated as a crucial aspect by scientist for laying hen welfare.

The above mentioned notes give an impression of the content of this report, and later this spring we will discuss the WP1 initiatives with stakeholders who represent the attitudes and views of retailers and NGOs and of the supply chain actors. As such, the findings of this WP are an important input for WP3, where adequate policy instruments for welfare enhancements will be identified.

Kees de Roest  
CRPA - Italy



## Work Package 3 – Development of policy instruments and indicators to monitor progress

Autumn 2009 saw the start of activities in WP 3 – they included brain storming with experts in Madrid (see pictures above) and consulting stakeholders in Brussels. The activities build on the knowledge gained in WP's 1 and 2 and will continue throughout 2010.

The main questions addressed in this WP are what policy instruments can be designed to further improve animal welfare, as aimed at in the Community Action Plan on Animal Welfare of Animals, and whether progress towards these standards/levels can be monitored? Work includes identifying a short list of potential policy instruments, refining them at the national level, and identifying indicators to document their effectiveness.

The main partners in this WP are the Landbouw-Economisch Instituut (LEI), part of Social Sciences Group of Wageningen University and Research Centre, The Netherlands, and Newcastle University's School of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development in the UK. The Work Package is coordinated by the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences.

Forty researchers from both the social and animal sciences took part in a structured brainstorming exercise about animal welfare policies in Madrid in September. Partners in the project were also interviewed in depth about the animal welfare situation in their respective countries. From these activities some preliminary patterns emerged that were presented at the plenary meeting of the Commission's Advisory Group on the Food Chain, Animal and Plant Health in Brussels in December. It was clear that no single option can be proposed across the whole EU, but rather several regional options. We were able to get valuable feedback on the four regional models and the proposed policy focus associated with them. We also presented a first tentative list of indicators at the animal, supply chain and society levels.

We are now working to develop these further, with a view to launching an internet consultancy exercise to test these policy options and monitoring instruments at a national level. We thank those people that have already taken the time to give their views and hope that many new regional experts will take part in the next phase of this Work Package.

Linda Keeling  
SLU - Sweden

# EconWelfare on tour

In the past few months members of the EconWelfare team have presented the project to different groups of people to discuss initial results as well as first thoughts on the second half of our project.

## Advisory Group on the Food Chain

As part of our WP3 discussions with Stakeholder groups, Linda Keeling and I presented our project to the Advisory Group on the Food Chain, Animal Health and Plant Health on December 4<sup>th</sup> 2009. This Advisory Group provides input into the preparation, revision and evaluation of legislative proposals. As part of the public consultation process, members can ask the Commission issues of particular relevance to their sector, such as animal welfare. The agenda allowed us 40 minutes of their valuable time, but the questions and discussions on the WP3 statements Linda presented carried on for over an hour. The Advisory Group raised several issues, such as conflicts with environmental issues, which may arise when striving for higher welfare. We also spoke about confusion among consumers, because of the diversity and complexity of labels and logos. Another point that was raised was that the wishes of consumers and citizens are often quite different, even if we are talking about the same people.... The group raised more questions than we could answer, but all of these will find a place in our models and potential policies for improved welfare.

## Copa-Cogeca

Together with Kees de Roest, I was invited to meet the Copa-Cogeca working party on Animal Health and Welfare (<http://www.copa-cogeca.be>), on December 9<sup>th</sup> 2009. The members of the working party have followed the developments of other EU animal welfare projects with great interest, and were keen to learn about our project. Our presentation was followed by a lively discussion on intra community trade, the need to understand differences within Europe, but also the need for a level playing field. They stressed the importance of a scientific impact assessment of welfare policies and wished us well. We will definitely be back at one of their meetings, once we have a few more results to present!

## European Animal Welfare Platform

On 14 January 2010 Kees and I met with the management team of the European Animal Welfare Platform (EAWP; <http://www.animalwelfareplatform.eu>). This platform aims at improving farm animal welfare throughout the food chain. It does so by providing a discussion platform where stakeholders can meet: consumers, farmers, breeders, retailers, academics and a variety of NGO's. The overall aims of the Platform complement those of EconWelfare, and ideas on areas of collaboration started to grow quickly: EAWP consists of stakeholders with ideas on how to improve animal welfare via the food chain and EconWelfare has scientists keen to estimate the impacts. I am sure we will be seeing a lot of each other in the future!

Hans Spoolder

## Acronym project

- EconWelfare  
[www.econwelfare.eu](http://www.econwelfare.eu)

## Project full title

- Good animal welfare in a socio-economic context: Project to promote insight on the impact for the animal, the production chain and European society of upgrading animal welfare standards.

## Funding

- FP7 programme of the European Commission

## Projectnumber

- KBBE-1-213095

## Total cost

- 1.3 million euro

## Duration

- August 2008 - July 2011

## Project Coordinator

- Dr. Hans Spoolder, Wageningen UR Livestock Research, Lelystad

## Project Office

- Mrs. Anke de Lorm  
P.O. Box 65  
8200 AB Lelystad, The Netherlands  
Phone +31 320 293503  
[info@econwelfare.eu](mailto:info@econwelfare.eu)

