



House of Commons

Environment, Food and Rural
Affairs Committee

Moving animals across borders

First Report of Session 2021–22

*Report, together with formal minutes relating
to the report*

*Ordered by the House of Commons
to be printed 23 September 2021*

HC 79

Published on 30 September 2021
by authority of the House of Commons

The Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee

The Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and associated public bodies.

Current membership

[Neil Parish MP](#) (Conservative, Tiverton and Honiton) (Chair)

[Ian Byrne MP](#) (Labour, Liverpool, West Derby)

[Geraint Davies MP](#) (Labour (Co-op), Swansea West)

[Dave Doogan MP](#) (Scottish National Party, Angus)

[Rosie Duffield MP](#) (Labour, Canterbury)

[Barry Gardiner MP](#) (Labour, Brent North)

[Dr Neil Hudson MP](#) (Conservative, Penrith and The Border)

[Robbie Moore MP](#) (Conservative, Keighley)

[Mrs Sheryll Murray MP](#) (Conservative, South East Cornwall)

[Julian Sturdy MP](#) (Conservative, York Outer)

[Derek Thomas MP](#) (Conservative, St Ives)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publications

© Parliamentary Copyright House of Commons 2021. This publication may be reproduced under the terms of the Open Parliament Licence, which is published at www.parliament.uk/site-information/copyright-parliament.

Committee reports are published on the Committee's website at www.parliament.uk/efracom and in print by Order of the House.

Committee staff

Alexander Bellis (Committee Specialist), Ian Blair (Committee Operations Officer), Sean Kinsey (Committee Clerk), Jonathan Finlay (Committee Specialist), Andy French (Committee Specialist), Ellie Goodchild (Committee Specialist), Tim Jarrett (Second Clerk), Emily Pritchard (Media Officer), Annabel Russell (Committee Operations Officer) and Chloe Sawyers (Committee Operations Manager).

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to the Clerk of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee, House of Commons, London SW1A 0AA. The telephone number for general enquiries is 020 7219 1119; the Committee's email address is efracom@parliament.uk.

You can follow the Committee on Twitter using [@CommonsEFRA](https://twitter.com/CommonsEFRA).

Contents

Summary	3
Background	5
1 Moving Pets	7
Changes to pet travel rules	7
Pet Smuggling	8
Sentencing and prosecution	8
Enforcement at the border	9
Taking pets from Great Britain into Northern Ireland and Europe	11
Pre-import health checks	13
2 Moving horses	16
Replacing the Tripartite Agreement	16
Horse Smuggling	18
Equine identification	20
3 Moving livestock	22
Border control posts	22
Livestock movements between Great Britain and Northern Ireland	24
Ban on export for fattening and slaughter	27
British abattoirs capacity	28
Improvements to Animal Welfare in Transport	30
4 Biosecurity	32
Monitoring animal disease	32
Veterinary capacity	33
Conclusions and recommendations	35
Formal minutes	41
Thursday 23 September	41
Members present	41
Adjournment	41
Witnesses	42
Published written evidence	43
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	46

EMBARGOED ADVANCE NOTICE: Not to be published in full, or in part,
in any form before 00.01am on Thursday 30 September 2021

Summary

The UK-EU Withdrawal Agreement's transition period, during which the UK was no longer a member of the EU but remained a member of the single market and customs union, concluded on 1 January 2021. The processes for managing the movement of animals between Great Britain and the European Union that had been relied upon for many years came to an end. This report considers how pets, horses and livestock will now be moved between Great Britain, Northern Ireland, and Europe. It also considers how biosecurity in the UK can be best protected.

Two key themes emerged across these areas. The first is that the Government should adopt a practical and pragmatic approach when it comes to negotiation with the European Union. For many of the issues we consider, including scrapie regulations, the construction of border control posts and an agreement on 'high health status' horses, there are obvious and ready solutions that could be put in place if there is political will to do so on both sides. The second is that the introduction of laws and regulations to protect animal welfare is important but ultimately meaningless if they are not enforced. Lack of enforcement is a key factor in pet smuggling and illicit horse movements and must be addressed. Our key findings are as follows;

Moving pets

The Animal Welfare (Kept Animals) Bill will reduce the number of pets that an individual can bring into Great Britain from five to three. This is a positive step, which should help to reduce pet smuggling. However, there is evidence that the current rules are not being enforced at the border making it easy for pets to be illegally brought into the country. Prosecution rates and the sentences for pet smuggling are low, and do not act as an effective deterrent. The Government should increase the sentences given to pet smugglers, including greater consideration of custodial sentences. Increasing prosecution rates must also be a priority, as prosecution rates are proportionately low given the estimated size of the trade. Furthermore, Defra should include a ban on animals younger than six months, heavily pregnant animals, and animals which have been subject to poor welfare practices on the face of the Bill, rather than in secondary legislation. The Bill should also include a clear definition of 'heavily pregnant'.

A number of non-endemic canine diseases are on the rise in the UK. These pose a serious health risk to the UK pet population. The Government should introduce pre-import screening for non-endemic diseases which threaten the UK pet population. This should be accompanied by the reinstalment of tick and tapeworm treatment requirements and a rabies titre test for pets when they are being brought into the UK.

Moving horses

Britain is a leading player global equestrian market, which provides significant economic benefits to the UK. To protect this industry, the Government should work with the EU to secure an agreement on 'high health status' horses to allow for the expedited movement of horses across Europe. There is also evidence that horses are being illicitly moved out of Britain. As a matter of urgency Defra should investigate the scale and causes

of these illegal movements. The expedited movement of horses and the prevention of horse smuggling would be supported by the creation of an easy to use, digital-by-design identification system. This should form the basis of the Government's forthcoming consultation on horse identification.

Moving livestock

There are no border control posts currently approved to accept livestock in European ports. This prevents exports of livestock from Britain from entering mainland Europe. The Government should work with the EU to encourage the opening up of approved border control posts in Europe. Furthermore, the Government should ensure border control posts capable of processing live animals are operational in the UK by March 2022, when animals being imported into the UK will need to be checked at a border control post. This date is a deadline, not a target.

We welcome the ban on export for slaughter and fattening as an important step in protecting animal welfare. However, we are concerned that there may be unintended consequences. Particularly, that it may create longer journeys, which will have an adverse effect on animal welfare. There is a direct link between the Government's current policy of limiting journey times between the farm and abattoirs, and the need for a network of small and medium abattoirs spread geographically around the UK. Supporting and bolstering the UK abattoirs network will benefit our food security and protect animal welfare. Defra should recognise small and medium abattoirs as a national strategic asset. Defra should also establish a working group to assess how effectively and fairly regulations are being applied in small and medium abattoirs.

Protecting biosecurity

Diseases do not recognise borders. Enhancing biosecurity protects animal, plant and human health. It would be easier to monitor animal diseases in our closest neighbours if the UK regained access to the EU's Animal Disease Notification System. Regaining access would also benefit our European neighbours as it would allow them to better monitor disease in the UK. The Government should closely monitor veterinary capacity alongside projections of six-month demand and publish statistics on a quarterly basis.

Background

1. The UK-EU Withdrawal Agreement's transition period, during which the UK was no longer a member of the EU but remained a member of the single market and customs union, concluded on 1 January 2021. The processes for managing the movement of animals between Great Britain and the European Union that had been relied upon for many years came to an end. Owners could no longer use pet passports to take their pets to Europe and horses could not be moved under the Tripartite Agreement.¹ Significant questions have been raised about the effectiveness and proportionality of the replacement system of sanitary and phytosanitary (SPS) controls and the UK's 'part 2 listed status' under the EU's pet travel scheme.

2. Leaving the EU, and its Pet Travel Scheme (PETS), means that the UK may now set its own rules around the movements of companion animals. Under PETS an individual may travel with up to five animals. In practice, this means a vehicle with five passengers can legally move 25 cats, dogs or ferrets at one time. It is well documented that this regulation has been exploited by pet smugglers, who are able to easily move large numbers of animals illegally into the UK under the guise of being their own personal pets.² This practice has been a longstanding concern for animal welfare organisations. Furthermore, there have been reports that the pandemic has significantly increased demand for smuggled pets.³

3. In December 2020 Defra published the 'Improvements to Animal Welfare in Transport' consultation.⁴ This proposed a ban on the export of animals for slaughter and fattening amongst several further measures, such as new species-dependent maximum journey times. Many of these proposals were heavily criticised by the farming industry.⁵

4. We therefore launched our inquiry into Moving Animal Across Borders in January 2021, with the following terms of reference:⁶

- a) Does the UK have sufficient resources and capacity to certify, record and inspect animal movements across its borders?
- b) How effectively will the UK be able to conduct animal disease surveillance and respond to outbreaks?
- c) What impact will the new UK-EU agreement have on moving animals across the Irish border and between GB and the EU/Northern Ireland?⁷

1 The TPA enabled the movement of horses with high health status, between the United Kingdom, Republic of Ireland and France. On average there were more than 26,000 annual thoroughbred movements between these countries

2 House of Commons Library, [Puppy Smuggling](#), March 2019; Battersea Dogs and Cat Home ([MAAB0045](#)); The Canine and Feline Sector Group ([MAAB0036](#))

3 [Oral Evidence taken on 24 November 2020](#), HC 926 (2019–2021); BBC News, [Households 'buy 3.2 million pets in lockdown'](#), March 2021; Dogs Trust, [COVID-19 Crisis facing the UK's Dogs](#), Accessed July 2021

4 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, [Improvements to animal welfare in transport](#), December 2020

5 National Sheep Association ([MAAB0027](#)); The Scotsman, [Farming: Union hits out at new proposals for transport of livestock](#), February 2021; Ulster Farmers Union, [UFU disappointed by government announcement on live exports](#), December 2020

6 Environment Food and Rural Affairs Committee, [New Inquiry: How will new Brexit regulations affect pet travel and live animal exports?](#), January 2021

7 This language was used in the terms of reference at the time of the inquiry launch. We understand that there are several ongoing negotiations concerning the import of products of animal origin and live animals between Great Britain, Northern Ireland and Europe which are not addressed in this report.

- d) How should the Government balance animal health and welfare alongside economic interests?
- e) What impact will ending live animal exports for slaughter and fattening have on UK farmers, processors and other businesses?
- f) Does the UK have sufficient capacity to slaughter and process animals that are currently exported? If not, what could be improved?
- g) How will Great Britain leaving the EU Pet Travel Scheme affect both legal and illegal movements of animals between GB and the EU/NI?
- h) Are the current rules and checks on the movement of domestic animals strong enough to prevent illegal activity? If not, what could be improved?
- i) What impact will the EU Animal Health Law have on the movement of equines between GB and the EU/NI from April 2021?
- j) Will the rules and checks on the movement of equines be strong enough to prevent illegal activity? If not, what could be improved?

5. We received over 60 written submissions and held four oral evidence sessions, hearing from witnesses including animal welfare activists, farming organisations, the equine industry, and the Government. We would like to thank everyone who contributed to our inquiry.

EMBARGOED ADVANCE NOTICE: Not to be published in full or in part, in any form before 00.01am on Thursday 30 September 2021

1 Moving Pets

Changes to pet travel rules

6. Since 2014 the movement of cats, dogs and ferrets in and out of Britain has been regulated by the EU Pet Travel Regulation (576/2013), known as PETS.⁸ Under this law an individual may travel with up to five companion animals. Having left the EU, the UK may now set its own rules around the movement of companion animals.

7. Our predecessor Committee wrote to the Government in 2019 asking it to reduce the number of pet animals that can travel into the UK with one person.⁹ In May 2021, during this inquiry, animal welfare stakeholders repeatedly told us they wanted to see the number reduced to three animals per person.¹⁰ The consensus was that three was the correct amount as most owners have three or fewer pets.¹¹

8. In June 2021 the Government introduced the Animal Welfare (Kept Animals) Bill.¹² Part 3 of the Bill will introduce “new powers to tackle the unethical trade of puppy smuggling” by reducing the number of animals that can travel into the UK, from five to three per individual, with a limit of five per motor vehicle.¹³ **The Committee sees the introduction of this new regulation as an important step in preventing pet smuggling and is pleased the Government has acted on our recommendation.**

9. Animal welfare groups like Dogs Trust, the RSPCA and Blue Cross outlined their support for several other statutory changes, including:

- **Increasing the minimum age of pets that can be brought into the UK from three months to six months.** They argued that this would reduce the demand for animals which have been smuggled into the country because of buyer demand for young animals.¹⁴ Furthermore, a higher age limit would be easier to enforce at the border as it is easier to distinguish age when the animal is more developed.¹⁵
- **Banning the import of heavily pregnant animals.** Moving an animal while it is pregnant, especially in the later stages of its pregnancy, is very traumatic for the animal and can increase the death rate at birth.¹⁶
- **Banning the import of animals that have been subject to ‘low animal welfare practices’.** These include ear cropping in dogs or declawing in cats, both of which are illegal in the UK.¹⁷

8 Official Journal of the European Union, [Regulation \(EU\) No 576/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council](#), June 2013

9 Environment Food and Rural Affairs Committee, [Correspondence to Rt Hon Teresa Villiers MP, regarding puppy smuggling](#), November 2019

10 Battersea Dogs and Cats Home ([MAAB0045](#)); Canine & Feline Sector Group ([MAAB0036](#)), [Q99](#) [Paula Boyden]; [Q98](#)

11 [Q101](#) [Maggie Roberts]; [Q101](#) [Paula Boyden]

12 [Animal Welfare \(Kept Animals\) Bill](#) [Bill 13 (2021–2022)]

13 Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, [New Animal Welfare Bill launched to protect pets, livestock and wild animals](#), June 2021

14 [Q99](#) [Maggie Roberts]; [Q111](#) [Maggie Roberts]; [Q111](#) [David Bowles]; [Q111](#) [Paula Boyden]

15 [Q96](#) [Paula Boyden]; [Q97](#) [Maggie Roberts]

16 [Q98](#) [Paula Boyden]

17 [Q110](#) [David Bowles]; [Q110](#) [Maggie Roberts]

10. In the Animal Welfare Action Plan the Government committed to using the Kept Animals Bill to bring in powers to ban the import of young animals, heavily pregnant animals, and animals which have been subject to poor welfare practices through secondary legislation.¹⁸ Lord Benyon, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, told us that introducing further restrictions via secondary legislation, rather than putting a ban on the face of the Bill, allows the legislation to be “enabling”. He explained that it will “give future Ministers the opportunities to amend legislation” as “science and intelligence on illegal trade changes.”¹⁹

11. In August 2021 Defra launched a public consultation asking for views on; increasing the minimum age at which dogs can be brought into Great Britain to six months; prohibiting the movement into Great Britain of dogs which have been subjected to mutilations, such as cropped ears and docked tails; and, prohibiting the import of heavily pregnant dogs into Great Britain.²⁰ The consultation noted that these proposed changes would be introduced “through secondary legislation under the enabling power included in the Animal Welfare (Kept Animals) bill.”²¹

12. We welcome the Government’s commitment to ban the import of pets younger than six-months-old, heavily pregnant pets, and pets that have been subject to poor animal welfare practices. We recognise the argument that ministers should be able to adapt regulations as science and intelligence evolve. However, we see no future where the movement of young animals, heavily pregnant animals or the import of animals which have been subject to poor welfare practices is acceptable. The need to prevent pet smuggling is serious and urgent, introducing these bans through later secondary legislation will only create further delays, enabling this illicit trade to continue. *The Bill should maintain the flexibility to allow ministers to adapt to future science and intelligence, but Defra should include a ban on animals younger than six months, heavily pregnant animals, and animals which have been subject to poor welfare practices on the face of the Bill, rather than secondary legislation. It should include a clear definition of ‘heavily pregnant’. Putting these prohibitions in primary legislation would be a serious and sincere statement about the value the Government attaches to animal welfare.*

Pet Smuggling

Sentencing and prosecution

13. This Committee and its predecessor have both considered pet smuggling,²² and a recurring theme has been that pet smuggling is low risk and high reward. A lack of accurate data makes it hard to put a value on the trade in smuggled pets. However, in November 2020, Dr Maher of the University of South Wales estimated, using research based on online advertising, that the value is around £130 million over a three month period.²³ During our

18 Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, [Action Plan for Animal Welfare](#), May 2021; the powers are contained in Clause 46 of the Bill as introduced, [Animal Welfare \(Kept Animals\) Bill](#) [Bill 13 (2021–2022)]

19 [Q254](#) [Lord Benyon]

20 Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, [Commercial and Non-Commercial Movements of Pets into Great Britain](#), August 2021

21 Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, [Commercial and Non-Commercial Movements of Pets into Great Britain](#), August 2021

22 [Oral Evidence taken on 24 November 2020](#), HC 926 (2019–2021); [Oral Evidence taken on 23 October 2019](#), HC 45 (2017–2019)

23 Oral Evidence taken on Tuesday 24 November 2020, HC 926 (2019–2021) [Q4](#), Dr Maher

current inquiry David Bowles, Head of Public Affairs at the RSPCA, told the Committee that “You can buy a dog in Romania for €40 and sell it here for £400 or even £1,000.”²⁴ Paula Boyden, Veterinary Director at Dogs Trust, said that it is “not uncommon to see adverts for puppies being sold for £3,000, £4,000, £5,000.”²⁵ Furthermore, Dr Maher told us that enforcement agencies and NGOs link pet smuggling with organised crime gangs, “whether that is tax evasion or more serious types of criminality.”²⁶

14. While profits are high, sentences and prosecution rates are low. Paula Boyden explained that “the maximum penalty for illegal importation is just a year”²⁷ because it is not classified as an animal welfare offence. This means it is not covered by the Animal Welfare (Sentencing) Act 2021 which, increased sentences for animal welfare offences to a maximum of five years.²⁸ David Bowles told us that the UK’s current sentencing rules do not act as a deterrent to puppy smugglers:

We prosecute puppy dealers who have been earning £2 million or £3 million a year, and they go to prison for 10 weeks. They are still puppy dealing in prison and, when they come out, they immediately start up again. We have to get that balance of deterrence right.²⁹

15. Paula Boyden explained that since 2015 Dogs Trust have looked after over 1,500 dogs thought to have been smuggled into the UK.³⁰ From these 1,500 dogs there have been “two prosecutions, both of which were a low monetary fine, with no custodial sentences, so frankly, it is worth taking the risk.”³¹ This was mirrored by evidence from the Animal Plant and Health Agency. It said between November 2020 and June 2021 there had been 41 referrals from carriers about pet smuggling, only three of which were being investigated by local authorities.³²

16. Steve Dann, Director National Operations HQ at Border Force told us that Border Force would like to see the Kept Animals Bill provide “opportunities” for a “focus on outbound cash and seizing assets of organised crime networks” as “a way to really hurt”³³ those responsible for pet smuggling.

Enforcement at the border

17. It is the responsibility of the carriers, meaning the ferry companies or the Eurotunnel, to undertake checks on pets as they move across the border.³⁴ In response to our call for evidence Defra said “We operate one of the most rigorous and robust pet travel checking regimes in Europe. All non-commercial dogs, cats and ferrets entering Great Britain (GB) on an approved route will undergo 100% documentary and identity checks.”³⁵ ‘Documentary and identity checks’ means the pets papers and microchip are checked.

24 [Q102](#) [David Bowles]

25 [Q117](#) [Paula Boyden]

26 Oral Evidence taken on Tuesday 24 November 2020, HC 926 (2019–2021) [Q4](#), Dr Maher

27 [Q122](#) [Paula Boyden]

28 [Animal Welfare \(Sentencing\) Act 2021](#)

29 [Q120](#) [David Bowles]

30 [Q99](#) [Paula Boyden]

31 [Q99](#) [Paula Boyden]

32 Animal and Plant Health Agency ([MAAB0064](#))

33 [Q169](#) [Steve Dann]

34 [Q145](#) [Steve Dann]

35 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([MAAB0054](#))

However, as explained by Dogs Trust, there is no requirement for the carriers to “visualise” the animal.³⁶ This means that there is no requirement to look at the animal to make sure it matches its papers and microchip.

18. There is well recorded evidence that smugglers will put a fraudulent microchip into the collar or carry case of an animal to pass the inspection.³⁷ Within this context, the absence of any requirement to visualise the animal is seen as a failing by animal welfare stakeholders. Paula Boyden said that without a requirement to look at the animal these checks “are not fit for purpose [...] it is a bit like you or I walking through an airport with a paper bag over your head.”³⁸ David Bowles, said that Defra’s assertion that pets undergo 100% checks was a “little disingenuous” and that without a requirement to look at the animal the checks are “meaningless”³⁹.

19. However, when we asked Lord Benyon about the lack of physical checks he said,:

Any APHA staff checking an animal will do a physical check of the animal. The documentation check by anybody who is checking it is important, but they also have to check the microchipping.”⁴⁰

20. Ian Hewitt, the Interim Chief Executive of APHA told the Committee that he is “confident that the carriers are doing a good job.”⁴¹ However, Dogs Trust stated:

there is great variation in the knowledge of the carriers and our experience ... is that intelligence sharing between the carriers and APHA is often left to individual relationships.”⁴²

The City of London Corporation, Dogs Trust and The Canine and Feline Sector Group said that asking carriers to check the pets of its customers is a conflict of interest because they are commercially incentivised to get as many passengers travelling as possible. These groups suggested that the responsibility for checking animals at the border should be shifted from carriers to an independent Government agency.⁴³

21. In February 2020 Lord Goldsmith, the Minister of State at the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, told us that “no funding was provided to Border Force or local authorities specifically to tackle pet smuggling in each of the last 5 financial years.”⁴⁴ In May, Steve Dann, Director National Operations HQ at Border Force , said that when it comes to enforcing the rules on pet smuggling the challenge for them is “prioritisation” and that they have “massive competing priorities in various areas.”⁴⁵ We asked Border Force and APHA if they had made an assessment of how their workload

36 Dogs Trust ([MAAB0048](#))

37 Dogs Trust ([MAAB0048](#))

38 [Q106](#) [Paula Boyden]

39 [Q112](#) [David Bowles]

40 [Q195](#) [Lord Benyon]

41 [Q148](#) [Ian Hewitt]

42 Dogs Trust ([MAAB0048](#))

43 City of London Corporation ([MAAB0047](#)); Dogs Trust ([MAAB0048](#)); [Q160](#) [Paula Boyden]; Canine and Feline Sector Group ([MAAB0036](#))

44 [Letter from the Rt Hon Lord Goldsmith to Neil Parish MP on puppy smuggling](#), HC 926 (2019–2021), 10 February 2020

45 [Q128](#) [Steve Dann]

would be affected by the Bill. Steve Dann, said, “I do not think we have really assessed the impact at all.”⁴⁶ Ian Hewitt said he ‘expected’ the Bill to lead to more physical and desk-based checks⁴⁷

22. **Currently pet smuggling is viewed as a low-risk and high reward crime. The UK must improve its deterrents against pet smuggling. *The Government should increase the sentences given to pet smugglers, including greater consideration of custodial sentences. Increasing prosecution rates must also be a priority, as prosecution rates are proportionately low given the estimated size of the trade. The Government should make use of its full suite of investigatory and enforcement powers to pursue the money generated from pet smuggling.***

23. ***It is the carriers not APHA staff who carry out most checks on pets at the border. Therefore, Defra should ensure that there is a legal obligation for the individual checking the animal to “visualise” the animal, making sure it matches the paperwork and microchip presented.***

24. **Moving the responsibility for checking pets at the border from carriers to a Government Agency will prevent the conflict of interests that is inherent within carriers checking the pets of their customers. *The responsibility for checking pets at the border should be shifted from carriers to a Government Agency like APHA or Border Force to ensure smuggling is dealt with effectively.***

25. **Within Defra’s policies there is an increasing focus on the prevention of pet smuggling. However, this increased policy focus has not been matched by an increased prioritisation of the issue or increased funding within Border Force or APHA. Furthermore, we note above the need for responsibility for checking pets at borders to move from the carriers to Government agencies. *Whichever of Border Force or APHA takes responsibility for checking pets must be properly resourced, and the Department should set out what steps it is taking within Government to ensure that this work is appropriately prioritised and resourced.***

Taking pets from Great Britain into Northern Ireland and Europe

26. As an EU member state, the UK held ‘Part 1 listed status’ under the EU’s Pet Travel Scheme. This allowed pets to easily move across the EU’s borders if they had a pet passport. This changed at the end of the transition period on 1 January 2021, after which point the UK was granted ‘Part 2 listed status’ under the EU’s Pet Travel Scheme, designating it as a ‘third country’.⁴⁸ Under ‘Part 2 listed status’ rules, each animal must be accompanied by an Animal Health Certificate (AHC) to travel into the EU or Northern Ireland.⁴⁹ The Northern Ireland Protocol requires that when a pet is moved between Great Britain and Northern Ireland, its movement must comply with EU regulations.⁵⁰ The AHC must be issued by a vet within 10 days of travel. It must include proof of a valid rabies vaccination and tapeworm treatment. Each new trip will require a new AHC.⁵¹ The Blue Cross has

46 [Q169](#) [Steve Dann]

47 [Q168](#) [Ian Hewitt]

48 House of Commons Library, [Brexit and Pet Travel](#), December 2020

49 House of Commons Library, [Brexit and Pet Travel](#), December 2020

50 Cabinet Office, [Northern Ireland Protocol - Command Paper](#), December 2020

51 [Taking your pet dog, cat or ferret abroad](#), (Accessed September 2021)

estimated that each AHC costs between £100 -£150.⁵² There are some non-EU countries which have ‘Part 1 listed’ status such as Switzerland, Andorra and Monaco. However, these countries have aligned with EU veterinary standards.

27. Paula Boyden called Part 2 listed status a “hindrance” for travellers wishing to take their pets abroad and noted it would create a financial “burden for the owner.”⁵³ Beyond the additional costs, the RSPCA told the Committee that the new system is more “complicated than the previous pet passport scheme and places a greater responsibility on pet owners wishing to travel with their animal.”⁵⁴ David Bowles also said that travellers may be unaware and unprepared for the changes. He was critical of the Government’s communication of the changes saying, “there has not been a lot of information about this, I think you could see people turning up, expecting to go away with their old pet passport and being turned back.”⁵⁵

28. The RSPCA urged the Government to “make a concerted effort to publicise these changes to allow owners to take the necessary steps and avoid a situation in which people travelling with their pets are turned back at the border.”⁵⁶ The need for more communications was supported by Maggie Roberts, Director of Veterinary Services at Cats Protection, who said, “There is a lot of confusion, both in the veterinary profession and among the public” and that Government should “get more information out there about what the regulations are.”⁵⁷ When asked about the lack of public understanding Lord Benyon said that “information on websites is now absolutely accurate and easy to disseminate.”⁵⁸ He said the Government had tested the public’s understanding of the new regulations with polling which “suggests that the public do understand it.”⁵⁹

29. It is unclear whether travellers have understood the requirements of the new pet travel regulation. There is a risk that as travellers wishing to take their pets abroad will be sent home at the border. Defra should continue its efforts to ensure travellers understand the new pet travel regulations. The current reduction in travel provides an opportunity to ensure no pet owner is turned back home at the border once travel increases.

30. While clear communication is a short term and limited solution to pet travel, we were informed that the easiest way to overcome the barriers imposed by ‘Part 2 listed status’ would be for the UK to regain ‘Part 1 listed status’ under the EU’s Pet Travel Scheme.⁶⁰ The need for an AHC to take a pet to Northern Ireland is particularly disappointing given Lord Goldsmith’s assurances that taking a dog to Northern Ireland from England would be no different to taking it to any other country in the United Kingdom, on 24 November 2020.⁶¹

31. The RSPCA told us that, given the current relationship between the UK Government and the EU Commission, “it is doubtful the Commission will grant Part 1 in the immediate

52 Blue Cross, [Animal health certificate](#), February 2021

53 [Q91](#) [Paul Boyden]

54 RSPCA ([MAAB0010](#))

55 [Q93](#) [David Bowles]

56 RSPCA ([MAAB0010](#))

57 [Q94](#) [Maggie Roberts]

58 [Q208](#) [Lord Benyon]

59 [Q208](#) [Lord Benyon]

60 [Q91](#) [Paula Boyden]; RSPCA ([MAAB0010](#)); Blue Cross ([MAAB0039](#))

61 Oral Evidence taken on Tuesday 24 November 2020, HC (2019–2021) 926, [Q18](#) [Lord Goldsmith of Richmond Park]

future.”⁶² Defra told us that “The United Kingdom (UK) applied to the EU Commission to become a ‘Part 1 listed’ third country in relation to the EU Pet Travel Scheme in January 2019, and then again in February 2020.”⁶³ Both applications were rejected. Defra said it “will continue to press the EU Commission on securing Part 1 listed status.”⁶⁴ Lord Benyon said that there are “Ongoing discussions with the Commission” in order to achieve Part 1 status.⁶⁵ He also suggested that the SPS Committee, which is meeting in the autumn, would be an appropriate forum to raise the issue.⁶⁶ A specialised SPS Committee has been established under the UK/EU Trade and Co-operation Agreement, to see if further facilitations on sanitary and phytosanitary measures between the UK and the EU are available without compromising biosecurity.⁶⁷

32. Regaining ‘part 1 listed’ under the EU’s Pet Travel Scheme will make taking pets to the EU and Northern Ireland easier and less costly. The Government should engage with the EU and adopt a pragmatic stance in the pursuit of either ‘Part 1 listed’ status in the EU Pet Travel Scheme’, or an arrangement which is as close to ‘Part 1’ status as is possible within the current political context environment.

Pre-import health checks

33. There is a risk that pets imported from Europe, especially those which been smuggled into the UK, are introducing dangerous non-endemic diseases into the UK. Babesiosis, Leishmaniasis and Brucellosis, are all examples of non-endemic diseases affecting pets that have recently been recorded in the UK.

34. In 2019, the first case of leishmaniosis in a dog which had not been abroad, was diagnosed in Hertfordshire.⁶⁸ Since the summer of 2020 there have been over 250 positive cases of Brucellosis infection in dogs, mostly directly imported into the UK from Eastern Europe.⁶⁹ There were a cluster of babesiosis cases reported in Harlow and Romford in 2016, as well as more recently in Hertfordshire in 2017.⁷⁰ More concerningly, in July 2020 the first known UK-acquired Babesiosis in humans was confirmed. Two people living on the south coast were hospitalised.⁷¹

35. The Canine and Feline Sector Group said:

“Vets are reporting that they are seeing puppies, that appear to have been legally imported commercially by ‘charities’ with questionable documentation regarding validity/accuracy, which are positive for leishmaniosis with the client having little understanding of the zoonotic potential of the disease.”⁷²

62 RSPCA ([MAAB0010](#))

63 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([MAAB0054](#))

64 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs ([MAAB0054](#))

65 [Q208](#) [Lord Benyon]

66 [Q209](#) [Lord Benyon]

67 The Institute for Government, [UK–EU future relationship: the deal](#), (accessed July 2021)

68 British Medical Journal, [First reported UK case of likely dog to dog transmission of leishmaniosis](#), April 2019

69 Public Health England, [Risk review and statement on the risk Brucella canis presents to the UK human population](#), February 2021

70 Ian Wright, [Babesiosis in Essex, UK: monitoring and learning lessons from a novel disease outbreak](#), March 2018

71 The Independent, [Babesiosis: First UK case of deadly tick-borne disease discovered in England](#), July 2020

72 Canine and Feline Sector Group ([MAAB0036](#))

The growth of these diseases is significant. Babesiosis and Leishmaniasis can be fatal, Brucellosis can prevent reproduction.⁷³ Furthermore, as the diseases are all non-endemic to the UK, the native pet population have had no exposure to them and therefore have no natural resistance.⁷⁴ More concerningly, these diseases are zoonotic, meaning they can be passed to humans, as shown by the individuals with hospitalised with Babesiosis in 2020.⁷⁵

36. The Dogs Trust, RSPCA and Cats Protection explained that there is no requirement to screen animals for any non-endemic diseases as they move in and out of the country.⁷⁶ They recommend that “consideration is given to introducing a requirement for disease screening for Brucellosis and Leishmaniasis, with dogs which test positive not being permitted to travel into the UK.”⁷⁷ Ms Roberts said there should be a particular focus on street animals, brought into the UK because they “may not be in great bodily condition and may never have had parasite control before.”⁷⁸

37. Furthermore, before the UK joined the EU pet travel scheme (PETS) there was a requirement for dogs, cats and ferrets to be given a compulsory tick treatment before entering or re-entering the UK.⁷⁹ There was also a requirement for dogs, cats and ferrets to have a tapeworm treatment 24-48 hours before travel. Under current regulation no animal needs to receive a tick treatment and only dogs need a tapeworm treatment 24-120 hours before travel.⁸⁰ Paula Boyden said that “One big error [...] in my opinion, was to remove the necessary tick treatment on re-entry to the country and to increase the tapeworm window before coming into the country.”⁸¹ The Dogs Trust, Cats Protection and the BVA all argued for the reintroduction of mandatory tick treatment, for cats to also be required to receive a mandatory tapeworm treatment, and for the time period between receiving a tapeworm treatment and travel to be reduced.⁸²

38. Witnesses were also clear that they wanted to see the reintroduction of the rabies titre test and extension of the wait time post rabies vaccination to 12 weeks.⁸³ A rabies titre test checks that there are rabies antibodies in the animal’s blood and verifies that the animal has been vaccinated.

39. A number of non-endemic canine diseases are on the rise in the UK. These pose a serious health risk to the UK pet population. There is a particular risk from street animals being rehomed in the UK and dogs which have been smuggled in. Leaving the EU gives the UK an opportunity to introduce regulations that will provide increased protection for animal health and biosecurity. The Government should act on this opportunity. *The Government should introduce pre-import screening for non-endemic diseases which threaten the UK pet population. This should be accompanied by the reinstalment of the UK’s tick and tapeworm treatment requirements that existed*

73. World Health Organisation, [Leishmaniasis](#), May 2021; [Babesiosis in Essex, UK: monitoring and learning lessons from a novel disease outbreak](#), Ian Wright, March 2018; Public Health England, [Risk review and statement on the risk Brucella canis presents to the UK human population](#), February 2021

74. Dogs Trust ([MAAB0048](#))

75. Ian Wright, [Babesiosis in Essex, UK: monitoring and learning lessons from a novel disease outbreak](#), March 2018

76. Dogs Trust, RSPCA and Cats Protection ([MAAB0061](#))

77. Dogs Trust, RSPCA and Cats Protection ([MAAB0061](#))

78. [Q123](#) [Maggie Roberts]

79. House of Commons Library, [Brexit and Pet Travel](#), December 2020

80. [Taking your pet dog, cat or ferret abroad](#), Government Guidance from GOV.UK

81. [Q97](#) [Paula Boyden]

82. Dogs Trust ([MAAB0048](#)), Cats Protection ([MAAB0031](#)), British Veterinary Association (BVA) ([MAAB0063](#))

83. [Q97](#) Maggie Roberts, [Q99](#) Paula Boyden

before the UK joined PETS. The UK should also introduce the rabies titre test as a way of ensuring animals have valid rabies vaccinations and the animal's paperwork has not been forged. The UK's biosecurity is being threatened now and these changes need to be brought in as soon as possible.

EMBARGOED ADVANCE NOTICE: Not to be published in full, or in part, in any form before 00.01am on Thursday 30 September 2021

2 Moving horses

Replacing the Tripartite Agreement

40. Over the past 50 years the movement of horses across European borders has evolved to become a standardised practice in horse sport, racing and breeding. Prior to the end of the transition period the majority of movements within the EU occurred between France, Ireland and Great Britain, under a system known as the Tripartite Agreement (TPA).⁸⁴ The TPA enabled the movement of horses with high health status, and on average there were more than 26,000 annual thoroughbred movements between these countries.⁸⁵

41. Beyond the TPA, horses were moved elsewhere in the European Union using the EU Balai Directive. The Directive requires equines to travel with two documents: an ID document (passport); and either an Intra-Community Trade Animal Health Certificate (ITAHC) or a veterinary attestation.⁸⁶ These documents confirm fitness to travel and absence of disease. Horses were not required to move through a Border Control Post (BPC) under either the TPA or the Balai Directive.

42. The TPA ceased alongside the transition period, and as a non-EU Member State the UK is unable to use the Balai Directive EU. Under the Northern Ireland protocol the movement of horses between Great Britain and Northern Ireland is now regulated by the EU's Sanitary and Phytosanitary controls (SPS).⁸⁷ This means that when a horse moves between Great Britain and the European Union or Northern Ireland:

- The owners must pre-notify the border authority before the horse is moved;
- The animal must meet pre-export isolation and residency requirements;
- The animal must be accompanied by an export health certificate (EHC); and
- The animal must move through a BCP set up to inspect equines.⁸⁸

43. Furthermore, on 21 April 2021 the EU's new Animal Health Law (Regulation (EU) 2016/429)⁸⁹ (AHL) came into force. It aims to prevent and control animal diseases that can be transmitted to animals or humans. Under its provisions, when a horse moves between Great Britain and the European Union or Northern Ireland it must also be tested for certain diseases, like equine infectious anaemia or equine viral arteritis before export and have the correct equine identification documents.⁹⁰

44. We asked witnesses about the impact of the SPS checks and the requirements of the Animal Health Law. Their responses were wide ranging:

84 British Horseracing Authority [MAAB0064]

85 British Horseracing Authority [MAAB0064]

86 Animal and Plant Health Agency, [Import of Animals under the 'Balai' Council Directive 92/65/EEC](#), (December 2020),

87 Cabinet Office, [Northern Ireland Protocol - Command Paper](#), December 2020

88 Animal Plant and Health Agency, [Export horses and ponies: special rules](#), September 2021

89 European Parliament and of the Council, [Regulation \(EU\) 2016/429](#), March 2016

90 BEVA, [MOVEMENT OF EQUINES BETWEEN THE UK AND THE EU AFTER BREXIT](#), January 2021

- Since January 2021 horse movements for racing and breeding have reduced by 40-60 percent.⁹¹ However, the coronavirus pandemic makes it hard to understand how the new rules affected the volume of movements.⁹²
- Relative to the previous arrangements, the process to move horses is considerably more administratively complex and time consuming.⁹³ With the new system “proving more difficult for some of the smaller operations in the industry.”⁹⁴
- The cost of moving a horse has increased. Jan Rogers, Director of Research and Policy at the Horse Trust, told us that “cost increases are at least double in every case” and that some instances the cost has risen by 300%.⁹⁵ In her view this price rise was particularly “prohibitive” for amateur competitors.⁹⁶
- There have been significant delays at Border Control Posts. Jan Rogers reported that horses were waiting between three and seven hours to be processed at Calais, and highlighted one case where the animal had to wait nine hours.⁹⁷ Horses find transportation to be a stressful experience, therefore any unnecessary delay puts the animal’s welfare at risk.⁹⁸
- From a welfare perspective it is preferable for horses to travel at night when the roads are quieter, and the temperatures are cooler, but this is not possible because “the border control post at Calais is open only between 8 [am] and 6 [pm].”⁹⁹

45. The British Horseracing Association warned that in the long term the administrative and cost barriers created by the SPS and animal health regulations could endanger the status of the British equine industry. Ross Hamilton, Head of Public Affairs at the British Horseracing Association, told us that “we are at the pinnacle of a very competitive international industry” and these barriers put the industry at a “competitive disadvantage” which could cost “hundreds of millions of pounds if this cannot be resolved in the medium to long term”.¹⁰⁰

46. Witnesses told us that the implementation of an international agreement to allow the frictionless movement of ‘high health status’ horses would be an optimal solution to this issue.¹⁰¹ The concept of ‘high health status’ horses is defined by The World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE), the intergovernmental organisation responsible for improving animal health worldwide.¹⁰² The principle of ‘high health status’ horses is that the designated equines are “of a permanent high health and welfare status” that there is no biosecurity risk in moving them across borders.¹⁰³ Jan Rodgers told us that

91 [Q55](#) [Ross Hamilton]

92 [Q55](#) [Ross Hamilton]

93 [Q55](#) [Ross Hamilton], [Q58](#) [Jan Rodgers]

94 [Q55](#) [Ross Hamilton]

95 [Q61](#) [Jan Rodgers]

96 [Q61](#) [Jan Rodgers]

97 [Q70](#) [Jan Rodgers]

98 [Q58](#) [Roly Owers]

99 [Q59](#) [Roly Owers]

100 [Q60](#) [Ross Hamilton]

101 [Q61](#) [Roly Owers], [Q67](#) [Jan Rodgers], [Q68](#) [Ross Hamilton]

102 [Q171](#) [Professor Middlemiss]

103 International Horse Sport Confederation, [A High Health Horse \(3H\) status in the EU Animal Health Law](#), accessed September 2021

“It is an international concept and widely understood.”¹⁰⁴ She explained that the concept could be a “logical replacement for the tripartite agreement” and that it could be used to create a regional agreement which would allow for the expedited movement of horses without them having to follow the full SPS process.¹⁰⁵ Professor Christine Middlemiss, the Chief Veterinary Officer for the UK supported an agreement on ‘high health status’ horses. She said that the new system should be EU wide rather than “just about specific countries.”¹⁰⁶ She noted that there “would be a lot of administration and standards-setting to get those common parameters” but that the practicalities had been discussed at The World Organisation for Animal Health.¹⁰⁷

47. Ross Hamilton explained that an agreement is also desired by industry groups across Europe. He told us that “France and Ireland are absolutely pushing their own Governments and the European Commission ... I think the representations continue to be very strong, certainly from the French and Irish racing industries.”¹⁰⁸

48. Lord Benyon told the Committee that the “The high-health-status approach is one that we can see a resolution to in time.”¹⁰⁹ He welcomed the support of industry lobbying which he said had “managed to get hard evidence to the Commission and has had a very favourable response, right from the top.”¹¹⁰

49. Britain is a leading player in the global equestrian market, which provides significant economic benefits to the UK. The Government must enable the expedited movement of ‘high health status’ horses across Europe to protect this industry. An agreement on high health status horses would benefit all parties involved and has been advocated by the British, Irish and French racing and breeding industries to the highest levels of the European Commission. *The Government should work with the EU to formulate an agreement on ‘high health status’ horses as quickly as possible. This agreement should be based on a system which is digital by design and easy to use. The Government should adopt a pragmatic and practical stance in pursuit of this goal.*

Horse Smuggling

50. World Horse Welfare (WHW), the RSPCA and the Countryside Alliance explained that some horses were nominally being exported for sale in Europe but, in reality, were being sent to slaughter.¹¹¹ It is currently legal to export a horse for slaughter, however, there have been no declarations of horses being exported for slaughter for many years.¹¹² The British Horse Council said it questions “the reality of this as horses and ponies are exported for a variety of reasons and there is no way to guarantee that a horse declared as being exported for riding will not be sold at a market for meat.”¹¹³ WHW suggest that

104 [Q67](#) [Jan Rodgers]

105 [Q67](#) [Jan Rodgers]

106 [Q163](#) [Professor Middlemiss]

107 [Q163](#) [Professor Middlemiss]

108 [Q68](#) [Ross Hamilton]

109 [Q211](#) [Lord Benyon]

110 [Q211](#) [Lord Benyon]

111 RSPCA [[MAAB0010](#)], Countryside alliance [[MAAB0050](#)], World Horse Welfare [Exports and imports from/to the UK](#), (accessed September 2021)

112 RSPCA [[MAAB0010](#)]

113 British Horse Council [[MAAB0044](#)]

there are several reasons why horses are illicitly moved into Europe, including for the profits of selling them into the food supply chain and because slaughter is cheaper in Europe.¹¹⁴

51. Roly Owers told us that “there is one dealer who will make weekly trips to the EU. They have a box that can take between 18 and 20 horses. They will often be double-loaded, so that could be up to 40. If you look at that over a year, you are looking at between 1,000 and 2,000 equines being transported. That is just one dealer. We believe we are only scratching the surface.”¹¹⁵

52. Roly Owers was also clear that smuggling endangers the welfare of the horses involved. He explained that:

some of these non-compliant vehicles will be overweight. The competence of the driver is often questionable and therefore the movement is extremely rough. There will be significant injuries to horses, which we have seen at first hand at some border control posts on the continent. They will not be getting the proper rest stops—which under current law need to be every nine hours—or then, every 24 hours, getting a stop, obviously with ad-lib food and water through that journey.¹¹⁶

53. We asked equine experts if they knew how many horses are being illegally moved across Britain’s borders. Roly Owers Chief Executive of WHW said “no one knows”.¹¹⁷ Steve Dann, Director National Operations HQ, Border Force told the Committee Border Force had no intelligence on horse smuggling. He said, “It is very difficult, then, to assign resources or even form part of an intelligence assessment as to any activity that may or may not be required.”¹¹⁸ APHA said it is “difficult to follow through and detect” smuggling if they are moved for purposes other than that registered on the certificate.¹¹⁹

54. We have been told that there are horses being illicitly moved across Britain’s borders and being sent to slaughter under the guise of being sold for other purposes. Defra should investigate non-compliant horse movements and quantify the scale and causes of the practice. This work should take place in collaboration with industry groups like World Horse Welfare who have developed intelligence and expertise on horse smuggling. Once the scale of the issue has been identified, Defra should set out a plan to address it within a year, and no later.

114 World Horse Welfare [MAAB0070]

115 [Q73](#) [Roly Owers]

116 [Q81](#) [Roly Owers]

117 [Q73](#) [Roly Owers]

118 [Q160](#) [Steve Dann]

119 [Q160](#) [Ian Hewitt]

Equine identification

55. Every horse, pony, donkey, ass, zebra and mule requires an ‘equine passport’.¹²⁰ The document describes the animal by breed, colour, species, lists all vaccinations and names the registered owner.¹²¹ Since 2018 horse owners have also been required to microchip their animals.¹²²

56. Passports are issued through 81 Passport Issuing Organisations, a registered organisation or studbook that issues horse passports, and should be with the animal at all time.¹²³ Equine Register, a database organisation, manages their collective information on the Central Equine Database on behalf of Defra.¹²⁴ However, Roly Owers told us that many horses do not have a passport, that the current system is “as leaky as a sieve” and that there is “significant fraud.”¹²⁵ He said, “We certainly know of transporters who will transport horses—different horses—on the same passports.”¹²⁶

57. Witnesses told us that many of the passport issuing organisations use paper-based systems, which has led to many inaccuracies because it is hard to keep the systems up to date.¹²⁷ Jan Rogers said that “we know that there are about a million horses in the UK. There are more data records on the central database than there are horses, so some of those will have passed away, and there will be a number on there that don’t actually have passports that aren’t identified either.”¹²⁸

58. Roly Owers also told us that local authorities, who are responsible for making sure horses are registered, could better enforce the system of identification and incentivise owners to register their horses by making more use of their fixed penalties powers for those that do not comply.¹²⁹ He said that currently “many people think that the horse ID system is a bit of a joke because it is so poorly enforced. So enforcement is critical.”¹³⁰

59. In the ‘Animal Welfare Action Plan’, which Defra published in May 2021, the Government committed to a consultation on “changes to equine identification and traceability to improve biosecurity and animal welfare.”¹³¹ Witnesses were clear that the identification system that flows from this consultation should be digital. Ross Hamilton said that the industry would like “an e-passport system that is capable of acting as a lifetime digital document for a thoroughbred, encompassing identification, vaccination, medical records, movement and ownership information.”¹³² He highlighted that the horseracing industry has been developing these digital systems and that “there is lots of potential there in terms of working with Defra” and that the industry has been developing a system that “can speak to both UK and EU systems.”¹³³

120 HM Government, [Getting and using a horse passport](#), (Accessed September 2021)

121 HM Government, [Getting and using a horse passport](#), (Accessed September 2021)

122 Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs, [Compulsory microchipping to improve horse welfare](#), June 2018

123 The British Horse Society, [Horse Passports](#), July 2021

124 Equine Register, [Protecting the whole herd](#), June 2018

125 [Q76](#) [Roly Owers]

126 [Q76](#) [Roly Owers]

127 [Q65](#) [Jan Rodgers]

128 [Q65](#) [Jan Rodgers]

129 [Q79](#) [Roly Owers]

130 [Q79](#) [Roly Owers]

131 Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, [Action Plan for Animal Welfare](#), May 2021

132 [Q89](#) [Ross Hamilton]

133 [Q66](#) [Ross Hamilton]

60. Jan Rodgers explained that a digital system would help to enable an agreement on ‘high health status horses’ because it would create a centralised record of the horses health information, while also creating traceability, as it would allow a system to record a horse’s, “movements from their point of origin, from the premises where they originate to the venue that they have attended.”¹³⁴ Roly Owers noted that while this kind of digital traceability should expedite the legal movement of horses it should also make it easier to prevent horse smuggling by allowing “intelligence and focus” to be moved to “non-compliant equine movements.”¹³⁵ Jan Rodgers said that ideally the identification system should be accessed on a smart phone to make it as easy and simple to use as possible.¹³⁶ She went on to explain that the system must be truly digital, unlike the system of export health certificates which had a “digital front end” but, in reality, create pages of often redundant paperwork.¹³⁷

61. When asked about working with the equine industry to develop a digital identification system Lord Benyon said that “I absolutely want to do everything I can to try to resolve this, not just for racing but for the wider equestrian world.”¹³⁸ Gareth Baynham-Hughes, Director, Animal and Plant Health and Welfare at Defra said that “The review of the equine ID traceability regime will definitely be an increasing priority later in the year.”¹³⁹

62. The current system of equine ID is not fit for purpose. Its outdated and fragmented paper systems enable fraud. A digital identification system would help to prevent horse smuggling and enable the expedited movement of ‘high health status’ horses. The mandatory microchipping of equines facilitates a digital identification system, which we believe is available at the moment. Defra should move to this system as a matter of urgency. The proposals put forward in Defra’s upcoming equine identification consultation should be digital by design and easy to use, except in exceptional circumstances, such as the studbook network which is vital for the support of native, rare and indigenous breeds. It is our understanding that these systems already exist within the industry. The Government should embrace these systems or guarantee interoperability with them. Alongside this new identification system Defra should develop a funded action plan to enforce the identification rules. The consultation should be published within the next three months and the action plan should be published within three months of the consultation’s conclusion.

134 [Q61](#) [Jan Rodgers]

135 [Q69](#) [Roly Owers]

136 [Q75](#) [Jan Rodgers]

137 [Q64](#) [Jan Rodgers]

138 [Q217](#) [Gareth Baynham-Hughes]

139 [Q216](#) [Gareth Baynham-Hughes]

3 Moving livestock

Border control posts

63. Since January 2021 and the end of the transition period, any live animal exports into Europe and Northern Ireland from Great Britain must move through a border control post (BCP).¹⁴⁰ In April 2020 we heard that there were no BCPs in European ports approved to process live animals.¹⁴¹ This prevents the export of livestock into Europe, as flying livestock is too expensive to be commercially viable.¹⁴² Stuart Roberts, Deputy President of the NFU, said “There has been no trade in live animals between the UK and mainland Europe because there are no border control posts approved at the moment [...] since 1 January there have been no movements.”¹⁴³

64. Furthermore, the UK currently does not have any BCPs capable of processing live agricultural animals. However, animals being imported to the UK will not need to be checked at a BCP until March 2022.¹⁴⁴ This has created trade asymmetry between the UK and the EU. It is possible to import animals by sea from the EU into the UK, but it is not possible to export animals by sea from the UK to the European mainland.

65. Beyond trade asymmetry the lack of BCPs generated concerns for animal welfare. James Russell, President of the British Veterinary Association said he would anticipate that livestock from Great Britain would move through Ireland into mainland Europe, following “longer routes of crossing from Cork down into north-western France or possibly even down into Spain rather than just those short straits crossings.”¹⁴⁵

66. Stuart Roberts, was clear the construction of BCPs “needs to be raised up the political agenda.”¹⁴⁶ He said “It would be really good to see the UK Government in talks directly with the French Government to help push that border control post on just outside Calais.”¹⁴⁷ He continued that the lack of BCPs in Europe could have been caused by the industry interpreting the proposed ban on export for slaughter and fattening as a ban on the movement of all live animals, which has made commercial businesses “nervous” about investing.¹⁴⁸

67. Mr Roberts told us that the export of British breeding stock is “extremely important in terms of trade as well as in terms of our own productivity and pushing productivity and helping others around Europe.”¹⁴⁹ “In relative numbers, these are not huge numbers, but they are important in terms of value and in terms of what we are trying to achieve with

140 HM Government, [Export or move livestock and poultry](#), March 2021

141 [Q1](#) [Stuart Roberts]

142 Aviagen Group [[MAAB0043](#)], National Sheep Association [[MAAB0027](#)]

143 [Q1](#) [Stuart Roberts]

144 Michael Gove, 11 March 2021, [[Statement UIN HCWS841](#)]

145 [Q3](#) [James Russell]

146 [Q7](#) [Stuart Roberts]

147 [Q7](#) [Stuart Roberts]

148 [Q10](#) [Stuart Roberts]

149 [Q2](#) [Stuart Roberts]

our genetics and our breeding stock where we really lead the world.”¹⁵⁰ He asked for a “very clear statement from Government around the future of breeding stock”¹⁵¹ including that their export would not be banned.¹⁵²

68. Gareth Baynham-Hughes, Director, Animal and Plant Health and Welfare, Defra, said that the Government is in “conversations with a number of member states, including on this issue of BCP availability.”¹⁵³ He also explained that Defra has been providing “information about data flow and the value of these sectors”¹⁵⁴ so that commercial enterprises can make decisions about BCP construction.

69. In written evidence, Defra told the Committee that there will be:

[...] capacity for checks on live animals from the EU at the [GB] border. This will include BCP facilities for all types of animal imports at Dover and Holyhead. At Sevington, we will have facilities for all animal imports carried by Eurotunnel. In addition to existing provision at UK airports, there will be live animal capacity at Cairnryan, South Wales and a small provision for commercial pets at Tyne. It is also expected that other inland sites will have animal facilities, as well as at some commercial ports.¹⁵⁵

However, they provided no detail about when these BCPs are expected to open.

70. The BVA and the NFU both highlighted Portsmouth as a case study of a port which has not been able to build a BCP because of a funding shortfall caused by a reduction in the grants offered under the Government’s Port Infrastructure Fund.¹⁵⁶ Lord Benyon told the Committee that he knows “that there are gaps” and that funding will be a “challenge.”¹⁵⁷ He said that there will be another funding competition going to ports shortly.¹⁵⁸

71. Stuart Roberts told us that the Government needs to act now, to ensure that the UK has the capability to process live animal imports at BCPs By March 2022:

Let us remember that the March 2022 deadline is a deadline. The sooner we can get facilities up and running, the sooner we can open trade up and start to trade on our excellent genetics.¹⁵⁹

72. Lord Benyon told the Committee that the construction of BCPs is an “is absolutely an urgency” and said that Defra “want to do more and we have secured some funding, which I hope will fill a gap or gaps.”¹⁶⁰

150 [Q2](#) [Stuart Roberts]

151 [Q10](#) [Stuart Roberts]

152 The ban on the export for slaughter and fattening is discussed in more detail in paragraphs 87 to 92.

153 [Q220](#) [Gareth Baynham-Hughes]

154 [Q220](#) [Gareth Baynham-Hughes]

155 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [[MAAB0054](#)]

156 [Building of Brexit border posts faces delays, Financial Times, January 2021](#)

157 [Q225](#) [Lord Benyon]

158 [Q225](#) [Lord Benyon]

159 [Q10](#) [Stuart Roberts]

160 [Q226](#) [Lord Benyon]

73. The current lack of border control posts approved to process live animal exports in European ports is an effective ban on the export of British livestock to mainland Europe. The Government's strategy of incentivising the construction of border control posts by providing information on the value of the sector has not been successful. *The Government must work more closely with the EU and commercial partners to ensure that border control posts capable of processing livestock are built immediately in Northern European ports.*

74. *The Government must ensure border control posts capable of processing live animals are operational by March 2022. This date is an absolute deadline rather than a target. These posts should be geographically spread around the country and provide appropriate capacity to meet market demand to prevent overly long journey times which endanger animal welfare. Defra should publish information relating to the location and capacity of specific border control posts by December 2021 to allow businesses to prepare for the March 2022 deadline.*

75. British breeding stock is an important export. We are concerned that the ban on export for slaughter and fattening has been interpreted as a ban on the export of all live animals, which may have led to EU partners not prioritising suitable border posts. This could damage the export of British breeding stock. *Within a month of this report's publication Defra should provide a clear statement of support for the ongoing export of British breeding stock, emphasizing that these exports will not be affected by the ban on export for slaughter and fattening.*

Livestock movements between Great Britain and Northern Ireland

76. The Northern Ireland Protocol requires the animals moved into Northern Ireland from Great Britain to be treated as imports from a third country into the EU. Therefore, if livestock is moved from Great Britain to Northern Ireland it must follow the EU's full SPS checks including the need for pre-notification and an Export Health Certificate (EHC), an official document that confirms whether an export meets the health requirements of the destination country.¹⁶¹ Animals entering Northern Ireland must also be moved through a Northern Ireland point of entry (NIPOE), which are currently located at Belfast Port and Larne Harbor.

77. Northern Irish farming prides itself on the genetic integrity of its stock, as Victor Chestnutt of the Ulster Farmers Union (UFU) explained, "Northern Ireland is a region with very small family farms, so we do focus on pedigree breeding."¹⁶² Christine Middlemiss, the UK Chief Veterinary Officer, told us that the genetic stock in Northern Ireland is "essential and they are quite unique in the UK as well."¹⁶³ The movement of animals between Great Britain and Northern Ireland is important for maintaining this genetic integrity. Therefore, barriers that inhibit the movement of animals between Great Britain and Northern Ireland is a significant threat to the Northern Ireland farming industry.¹⁶⁴

161 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, [Get an export health certificate](#), June 2021

162 [Q11](#) [Victor Chestnutt]

163 [Q164](#) [Professor Middlemiss]

164 [Q17](#) [Victor Chestnutt]

78. Beyond the extra burden of SPS checks, the Committee was also told that residency requirements, ear tagging, and scrapie monitoring were preventing the movement of animals between Great Britain and Northern Ireland.¹⁶⁵

79. Following our evidence session with Lord Benyon, the European Commission announced that it and the UK Government had found solutions on the residency requirements and ear tagging issues.¹⁶⁶ On residency requirements, the Commission said that it is:

[...] working on a regulatory solution to facilitate the swift return of livestock to Northern Ireland from exhibitions or trade fairs in Great Britain, so that the animals concerned will not have to wait for a minimum residency period in Great Britain. The relevant delegated and implementing acts will be adopted in October 2021.¹⁶⁷

On ear tagging the Commission said that it has agreed to remove “the need for re-tagging when animals move multiple times between Great Britain and Northern Ireland during their life.”¹⁶⁸ This came into effect on 29 June 2021.

80. The scrapie monitoring system, however, is still preventing the movement of sheep between Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Scrapie is a fatal, degenerative disease affecting the nervous systems of sheep and goats. To prevent the spread of scrapie, the EU requires sheep entering the EU from a third country to have been part of the ‘scrapie monitoring system’ or have had a scrapie genotype test.¹⁶⁹

81. To be part of the scrapie monitoring system flocks must undergo an annual flock inspection by a vet, with a proportion of adult animals are screened for scrapie.¹⁷⁰ It takes three years to become partially certified and seven years to become fully certified. This long lead in time means that access to scrapie monitoring systems is not an immediate solution for Farmers in Northern Ireland.¹⁷¹ Individual genotype testing costs £30 per animal, a cost that some stakeholders say makes the trade uneconomical.¹⁷² Furthermore, many of the hill breeds that make up a substantial proportion of the trade would fail a genotyping test.¹⁷³

82. The National Sheep Association (NSA) said that “each year between 9000 and 18,000 sheep of high value are moved between NI and mainland Great Britain” and that scrapie rules have “completely disrupted” the breeding stock trade “with no effective warning or understanding.”¹⁷⁴ They warn that “On an industry scale this may be considered small

165 National Sheep Association [MAAB0027], National Farmers Union [MAAB0057]

166 The European Commission, [EU-UK relations: solutions found to help implementation of the Protocol on Ireland and Northern Ireland](#), 20 June 2021

167 The European Commission, [EU-UK relations: solutions found to help implementation of the Protocol on Ireland and Northern Ireland](#), 20 June 2021

168 The European Commission, [EU-UK relations: solutions found to help implementation of the Protocol on Ireland and Northern Ireland](#), 20 June 2021

169 National Sheep Association [MAAB0027], National Farmers Union [MAAB0057]

170 National Farmers Union [MAAB0057]

171 National Sheep Association [MAAB0027], National Farmers Union [MAAB0057]

172 National Sheep Association [MAAB0027]

173 National Sheep Association [MAAB0027], National Farmers Union [MAAB0057]

174 National Sheep Association [MAAB0027]

but for individuals affected the restrictions on movements to be imposed are creating catastrophic consequences for many of our pedigree breeders and those trading in commercial breeding animals on both sides of the water.”¹⁷⁵

83. Victor Chestnutt brought this issue to life when he informed us about a Northern Irish farmer who has “bought roughly around 400 blackface ewe rams every year in September in Scotland. This year, they were not told that there would be any difference, so they went ahead and bought their ewe lambs.”¹⁷⁶ These sheep were trapped in Scotland because they could not pass the Scrapie genome test. He told us that farmers had no way to prepare for these changes because “there was no grace period, because the deal was not done until the very last days and we were straight into implementation.”¹⁷⁷

84. Mr Chestnutt told us that joining the Scrapie monitoring system should be the “long-term objective” but in the short term the Government should seek a derogation for Northern Ireland.¹⁷⁸ He also emphasised that there must be a reasonable lead-in period to allow the industry to prepare; “We need a lead-in period to allow this trade to continue rather than just bouncing these things on people straightaway.”¹⁷⁹ The NFU stated “that the UK sought a 7-year derogation for breeding stock for the scrapie testing requirements, but this was turned down by the EU.”¹⁸⁰ The NFU and the NSA would like to see use of the Movement Assistance Scheme, a scheme set up by the Government to reimburse certain certification costs for moving agri-food goods, to cover the costs of scrapie testing.¹⁸¹

85. Lord Benyon said that he understood that the scrapie monitoring system was causing farmers “difficulties” and that “The Commission is quite sympathetic here, so we want to work with it.”¹⁸² Gareth Baynham-Hughes mirrored the advice of industry and said that the solution “would be a derogation of some form.”¹⁸³

86. The movement of agricultural animals between Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a practice that has existed for generations, has been disrupted by the Northern Ireland Protocol. The residency, scrapie and ear tagging requirements risk jeopardising the genetic integrity of Northern Irish breeding stock. Although it is a small number of farm businesses that are affected, these are often small, independent, family run business and the impact of the restrictions could be catastrophic.

87. The Committee welcomes the agreement between the Government and the Commission on residency requirements and ear tagging. However, the Government should monitor the implementation of the new systems to make sure they are fit for purpose and fully enable the movement of livestock from Great Britain into Northern Ireland. It should review these arrangements within 12 months of their implementation and report back to this committee.

175 National Sheep Association [[MAAB0027](#)]

176 [Q15](#) [Victor Chestnutt]

177 [Q15](#) [Victor Chestnutt]

178 [Q15](#) [Victor Chestnutt]

179 [Q15](#) [Victor Chestnutt]

180 National Farmers Union [[MAAB0057](#)]

181 National Sheep Association [[MAAB0027](#)], National Farmers Union [[MAAB0057](#)]

182 [Q231](#) [Lord Benyon]

183 [Q231](#) [Gareth Baynham-Hughes]

88. Furthermore, we welcome that the Government is working on a solution to the scrapie requirements, but a solution must be found immediately. *The Government should work with the EU to agree a derogation from the scrapie monitoring system, as quickly as possible. This derogation should provide adequate time for farmers to join the system. The Government should adopt a pragmatic and practical stance in pursuit of this goal.*

89. *In the short-term Defra should extend the Movement Assistance Scheme to pay for scrapie testing. The new breeding season for sheep is about to start meaning the Government needs to find an immediate solution to allow breeding stock from Great Britain to enter into Northern Ireland. As such, the Movement Assistance Scheme should be extended for this purpose by October 2021.*

Ban on export for fattening and slaughter

90. In May, Defra announced it will ban the export of animals for slaughter and fattening from England and Wales, including where the journey originates in another nation but passes through England or Wales.¹⁸⁴ The number of animals exported for slaughter and fattening is very small compared to overall UK herd size.¹⁸⁵ The current UK rules on the welfare of animals being transported for commercial purposes constitute EU retained law (derived from Council Regulation No 1/2005). While part of the EU, the UK could not ban live animal exports. However, it has been the UK Government's longstanding position that it would prefer animals to be slaughtered as close as practicable to their point of production.¹⁸⁶

91. Defra said that, "In 2020, around 2.8 million cattle, 14.5 million sheep, 11.2 million pigs and around one billion poultry were slaughtered in the UK."¹⁸⁷ In comparison, 16,000 animals were exported to Europe for slaughter in 2018.¹⁸⁸ On this basis Defra said that it "expect[s] a ban on exports for slaughter and fattening to have a relatively low impact on our farmers, processors and other businesses."¹⁸⁹ The ban has received strong support from animal welfare groups. The RSPCA said a live export ban would be a "landmark achievement for animal welfare"¹⁹⁰, while the campaign group Compassion in World Farming said they are "delighted" by this "unambiguous proposal."¹⁹¹

92. During our inquiry, witnesses from the NFU and the UFU said they did not support a ban on export for slaughter. Instead, Stuart Roberts told us that the NFU wanted tighter regulatory control on exports.¹⁹² Similarly, Victor Chestnutt, President of the UFU said "We do not see any reason to introduce additional controls or suddenly ban the live export of farmed animals."¹⁹³

184 Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs, [Action Plan for Animal Welfare](#), May 2021

185 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [[MAAB0054](#)]

186 [HC Deb, 6 Dec 2012 C893w](#)

187 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [[MAAB0054](#)]

188 Europa.eu, [TRACES data - Animals traded between Member States in 2018](#), (Accessed 2021)

189 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [[MAAB0054](#)]

190 BBC news, [Live animal exports to be banned in England and Wales](#), December 2020

191 Compassion in world farming, [VICTORY IN FIGHT TO BAN LIVE EXPORTS](#), December 2020

192 [Q28](#) [Stuart Roberts]

193 [Q29](#) [Victor Chestnutt]

93. There was a concern amongst some witnesses from the farming industry that the ban could unintentionally reduce animal welfare by leading to longer journey times. Over the past 20 years, the UK abattoirs network has become dominated by a few large abattoirs, spread across the UK.¹⁹⁴ Stuart Roberts told us that for some farmers, particularly in the east of England “your closest abattoirs may well be on the other side of a piece of water.”¹⁹⁵ This argument is particularly significant in the context of the Government has a manifesto commitment to end excessively long journeys for slaughter and fattening.¹⁹⁶ Minister Benyon highlighted the link between the ban and the need for robust slaughterhouse capacity; “We have to make sure that we have capacity in our existing slaughterhouses to feed this market.”¹⁹⁷

British abattoirs capacity

94. The Government’s ban on export for slaughter and fattening puts a focus on the domestic abattoir network and the role abattoirs play in supporting the British food supply chain. According to the Sustainable Food Trust, which runs a campaign to support small and medium abattoirs, “the national network of small local abattoirs is rapidly declining. There are now only around 100 small red meat abattoirs (those slaughtering no more than 1,000 livestock units annually) left in the UK.”¹⁹⁸

95. Despite the closure of many small and medium abattoirs, there is little evidence that the overall capacity of the network has declined or that the supply chain is ‘running out of capacity.’¹⁹⁹ Instead there has been a consolidation of the supply chain, with larger abattoirs and processors increasing capacity to meet retailer demand. A 2020 report from the All Party Parliamentary Group on Animal Welfare illustrated this trend:

In 2018 a total of 19,718,680 animals were slaughtered across 248 operating plants but 32 abattoirs in England slaughtered 88% all of the sheep, while just 19 abattoirs slaughtered 73% of all cattle.²⁰⁰

96. However, considering the overall capacity of abattoirs does not provide a full picture of the supply chain. The consolidation of abattoir services mean that the spread of services is not uniform across the UK, so many animals have to travel long journeys prior to slaughter. This undermines the ambition of the Government’s consultation on ‘Improvements to animal welfare in transport’ to reduce unnecessarily long journey times (discussed in more detail the next section).

97. The RSPCA also said there is a specific concern over slaughterhouse capacity for equines and cull animals (an animal at the end of its productive life). There are “four abattoirs licensed to take equines” and “only one in England is now regularly taking horses.”²⁰¹ As discussed in chapter 2 there is evidence that horses are being illicitly exported for slaughter. The RSPCA suggested that “The reduction in equine licensed

194 The British abattoirs network is explored in more detail in paragraph 94 - 102.

195 [Q27](#) [Stuart Roberts]

196 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, [Improvements to animal welfare in transport](#), December 2020

197 [Q236](#) [Lord Benyon]

198 Sustainable Food Trust, [Local abattoirs: Why they are closing and how we can save them](#), (accessed 2021)

199 RSPCA [\[MAAB0010\]](#)

200 [The Future For Small Abattoirs In The UK](#), The All-Party Parliamentary Group for Animal Welfare, June 2020

201 RSPCA [\[MAAB0010\]](#)

abattoirs over the past decade may have led to a rise in illegal exports ... further capacity may be needed if the ban [on exports for slaughter] is implemented to ensure this does not continue in the future.”²⁰²

98. Similarly, there is a lack of facilities for cull animals. The RSPCA explained that these animals are “particularly vulnerable to the stressors associated with transport” because of their poor body condition which means “they are at increased risk of suffering injuries during the journey.”²⁰³ For example, cull sows must travel from Northern Ireland to Great Britain because there are no suitable abattoirs in Northern Ireland.²⁰⁴ The RSPCA explained that, “The fragility of this system was exposed last year when abattoir capacities were reduced during the Covid-19 pandemic. This resulted in a backlog of sows, which caused difficulties for the supply chain with a consequential negative impact on welfare.”²⁰⁵

99. The UK Abattoir Network, an industry group representing abattoirs, told us that Defra “should recognise abattoirs, specifically including the smaller-scale abattoirs vital to an adequate local network, as a strategic national asset and integral to their future visions for sustainable farming and food resilience.”²⁰⁶ This view was supported by Professor Tim Morris, Special Professor of Laboratory Animal Welfare and Science at the University of Nottingham, who argued that the core issue with abattoirs is that “in the past nobody has treated the abattoirs—and the abattoirs are basically a network—as a strategic national issue.”²⁰⁷

100. The Abattoirs Sector Group, group established to represent small and medium abattoirs, told the Committee that the Future Farming Resilience Fund could be used to support small slaughterhouse businesses.²⁰⁸ The Future Farming Resilience Fund has been developed by Defra to help farming business adapt as the Common Agricultural Policy comes to an end in the UK. It offers support to help businesses understand the changes that are happening because of the Agricultural Transition; identify how, what and when they may need to adapt their business model; and how to access financial support to address these changes.²⁰⁹ The Abattoirs Sector Group view it is an appropriate mechanism to help build a resilient and financially viable network of small and medium abattoirs.²¹⁰

101. Lord Benyon agreed with witnesses that abattoirs are “strategic assets.” He said that “We have to recognise that there is a strategic-asset argument to make to sustain the existing abattoirs and encourage new ones, where possible.”²¹¹ He said that the Government can be economically interventionist, if it chooses to be, and that the abattoirs network may be an area that needs to be addressed.²¹²

202 RSPCA [MAAB0010]

203 RSPCA [MAAB0010]

204 RSPCA [MAAB0010]

205 RSPCA [MAAB0010]

206 The UK Abattoir Network, [MAAB0062]

207 Q43 [Professor Morris]

208 Abattoirs Sector Group [MAAB0071]

209 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, [Future Farming Resilience Fund to open in August](#), July 2021

210 Abattoirs Sector Group [MAAB0071]

211 Abattoirs Sector Group [MAAB0071]

212 Abattoirs Sector Group [MAAB0071]

102. Witnesses also told the Committee that the viability of small and medium abattoirs is often disadvantaged by complex regulations. Professor Tim Morris said that no new small and medium slaughterhouses are built because they are “required to have the same building regulations as an office building, which is patently ridiculous.”²¹³ The Abattoirs Sector Group said that there “are a number of examples of varying interpretations of the regulations, inconsistent approaches to implementation and unnecessary constraints.”²¹⁴ A key example of this is the failure to implement the ‘5% rule’, whereby if an abattoir exceeds 1000 animals, they are required to have full veterinary attendance instead of delayed post-mortem inspection, which increases the cost of production. However, the 5% rule allows a 5% margin of flexibility before veterinary attendance is required. The Abattoirs Sector Group and The UK Abattoirs Network suggested that the Defra should establish a streamlined working group focused on ensuring that regulations in small and medium sized abattoirs are applied in a proportionate and coordinated way.²¹⁵

Improvements to Animal Welfare in Transport

103. The consultation on the ban of export for slaughter and fattening was published in December 2020 as part of a call for evidence on Improvements to Animal Welfare in Transport.²¹⁶ Alongside the ban on export for slaughter, it also proposed further measures such as new species dependent maximum journey times and a prohibition on journeys if the forecast external temperature for the journey is outside of a temperature range of 5-30°C, unless the vehicle is temperature regulated.

104. The proposals were heavily criticised by the farming industry. NFU Scotland said the consultation was “deeply flawed [. . .] Regrettably, the driver behind much of this was a [Animal Welfare Committee] report that was, in our opinion, poorly written and simplistic in approach and shows no appreciation or understanding of livestock production across all parts of the UK.”²¹⁷ The National Sheep Association (NSA) said that it “exposes a serious lack of knowledge” about how the industry works.²¹⁸ The Ulster Farmers Union said, “this is not the first time the government has failed to recognise the importance of live exports, suggesting it highlights a lack of knowledge of agriculture.”²¹⁹

105. Concerns were raised about the temperature limits. Professor Tim Morris told the Committee that “from an equine point of view, of the 80 race meetings held in January, . . . 43 would have been cancelled” because the outside temperature was lower than five degrees²²⁰ Professor Malcolm Mitchell, Professor of Physiology and Animal Welfare, Scotland’s Rural College, said that “very often scientific fact does not support some of the proposals that have been put forward.”²²¹ Professor Morris told us that the proposals

213 [Q48](#) [Professor Morris]

214 Abattoirs Sector Group [[MAAB0071](#)]

215 The Abattoir Sector Group, [[MAAB0062](#)]

216 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, [Improvements to animal welfare in transport](#), December 2020

217 The Scotsman, [Farming: Union hits out at new proposals for transport of livestock](#), February 2021

218 National Sheep Association [[MAAB0027](#)]

219 Ulster Farmers Union, [UFU disappointed by government announcement on live exports](#), December 2020

220 [Q36](#) [Professor Morris]

221 [Q36](#) [Professor Mitchell]

would have benefited from “Some pre-discussions and preliminary co-design.”²²² When we asked the Chief Veterinary Officer about the proposals, she said “I get copied into lots of emails” and she could have “read the actual detail of it more thoroughly.”²²³

106. Gareth Baynham-Hughes, Director of Director, Animal and Plant Health and Welfare at Defra, said he regretted that the proposals “did not land in the right way and undermined a wider sense that we have been building over the last few years for really good and effective stakeholder engagement with the sector.”²²⁴ Defra have said they are “now considering this policy area in further detail to determine what will be taken forward in future legislation to improve transport conditions for animals.”²²⁵ Lord Benyon said that he will keep the proposals within “the realms of practicality.”²²⁶

107. We welcome the ban on export for slaughter and fattening as an important step in protecting animal welfare. We understand that the number of animal movements this ban will affect is small, however, we are concerned that there may be unintended consequences. Particularly, that it may create longer journeys, which may increase costs for some UK farms and could have the unintended effect of worsening animal welfare. We are also concerned that this will prohibit the movement of livestock for breeding purposes. *Defra should work with the organisations and businesses that will be affected by the ban on export for slaughter to ensure that the ban is introduced in a pragmatic way that will not adversely affect rural businesses or animal welfare.*

108. Supporting and bolstering the UK abattoirs network will benefit our food security and protect animal welfare. There is a direct link between the Government’s current policy of limiting journey times between the farm and abattoirs, and the need for a network of small and medium abattoirs spread geographically around the UK. Equally, small abattoirs must be commercially viable businesses, capable of supporting themselves. *Defra should take action to protect small and medium abattoirs as a national strategic asset. These businesses should be supported and bolstered through the Future Farming Resilience Fund. Defra should set out and enact its approach to funding the UK abattoirs network as a strategic national asset within six months.*

109. Heavy handed regulations can overburden small and medium abattoirs, preventing them from being successful commercial enterprises. *Defra should establish a small working group to assess how effectively and fairly regulations are being applied in small and medium abattoirs. This group should ensure regulations are sensible and maintain food hygiene standards without overloading businesses. This group should be established by December 2021.*

110. The Government’s proposals on ‘Improvements to animal welfare in Transport’ are well-meaning but flawed. They show a lack of understanding in how parts of the agricultural economy work and would have benefited from better co-design and consultation. *We welcome that Defra is rethinking its proposals. Defra should ensure they work with the industry to develop its new proposals, making sure they protect animal welfare while being practical and realistic. It should publish the updated proposals by December 2021.*

222 [Q36](#) [Professor Morris]

223 [Q187](#) [Professor Middlemiss]

224 [Q234](#) [Gareth Baynham-Hughes]

225 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [[MAAB0054](#)]

226 [Q232](#) [Lord Benyon]

4 Biosecurity

111. Biosecurity is the monitoring and prevention of “natural and accidental threats associated with either animal diseases, plant diseases and pests or invasive non-native species, have the potential to cause devastating effects on the nation’s health, security and economy.”²²⁷ Enhancing biosecurity protects animal, plant and human health. biosecurity is a primary reason why the movement of animals across Britain’s borders is regulated. It allows trading partners, consumers, and the agricultural industry to be confident in the high UK standards of food safety, animal and plant health. This chapter will consider the systems which monitor animal disease, the need for pre-import health checks and veterinary capacity in the post-transition period.

Monitoring animal disease

112. The Animal and Plant Health Agency is responsible for plant and animal disease surveillance in England, Scotland and Wales.²²⁸ In their written evidence Defra told the Committee that the UK has a “world-class” network of animal health risk analysts who carry out “horizon scanning and risk analysis, including monitoring developments around the world.”²²⁹

113. The European Union’s disease monitoring system is called the Animal Disease Notification System (ADNS).²³⁰ ADNS is no longer available to the UK as continued access was not negotiated as part of the Trade and Cooperation Agreement.²³¹ While ADNS is an EU system, there is already a precedent for countries outside of the EU having access in Switzerland, Norway and Turkey.²³² The UK continues to have access to the World Animal Health Information System (WAHIS), the disease notification system from the World Organisation for Animal Health. Beyond the WAHIS, information about animal disease in Europe is now coordinated through the Chief Veterinary Officer, Professor Christine Middlemiss. She said that she is responsible for “the assurance and verification of our disease status.”²³³ and that all updates go through her or her office. This now includes EU member states. She told us that she has put in place an “SPS trade and assurance office” to fulfil the “function that the EU did for us with the rest of the world and informing them.”²³⁴

114. Representatives of the NFU and the BVA told us they were concerned about this arrangement. The NFU stated that ADNS is “quicker and more detailed than WAHIS.”²³⁵ They explained that “Since 1st January [2021], the UK has only received information on outbreaks across the EU and the rest of the world because of good bilateral links within APHA to other countries.”²³⁶ James Russell, President of the BVA, said that if the UK does not regain access to the ADNS, “We would just be fighting to keep diseases away from

227 Animal and Plant Health Agency, [Animal and Plant Health Agency \(APHA\) science strategy, 2021 to 2026](#), April 2021

228 Animal & Plant Health Agency, [About us](#), (accessed 28/07/2021)

229 Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [[MAAB0054](#)]

230 National Farmers Union [[MAAB0057](#)]

231 National Farmers Union [[MAAB0057](#)]

232 National Farmers Union [[MAAB0057](#)]

233 [Q173](#) [Professor Middlemiss]

234 [Q173](#) [Professor Middlemiss]

235 National Farmers Union [[MAAB0057](#)]

236 [Q25](#) [James Russell]

our borders in a fog.”²³⁷ He explained “we have absolute faith in [the Chief Veterinary Officer’s] ability to make a risk judgment on that as a veterinary surgeon, but it places a huge onus on her shoulders and we need to be ready to be very responsive to ... the alteration in risk profile of disease states across the Channel.”²³⁸

115. Ian Hewitt, Interim CEO of the Animal and Plant Health Agency told us that having access to the ADNS “would mean that we have that holistic source, rather than having to go to disparate sources and trying to marry it up. It takes time and effort to try to do so, and speed is of the essence.”²³⁹ This view was shared by the Chief Vet.²⁴⁰ APHA said “We have alternative solutions in place and under development.”²⁴¹

116. Diseases do not recognise borders. Enhancing biosecurity protects animal, plant and human health. Although we have full faith in the Chief Veterinary Officer, it would be easier to monitor animal diseases in our closest neighbours if the UK regained access to the Animal Disease Notification System. ADNS is a quick and reliable system, and it would help to remove the opportunity for human error. Regaining access to the ADNS would also benefit our European neighbours as it would allow them to better monitor disease in the UK. This is a win, win situation. Failing to regain access could have catastrophic consequences for UK biosecurity, so the Government should work with the EU to regain Britain’s access to the ADNS as a matter of urgency Defra should update this committee on its efforts .

Veterinary capacity

117. Veterinary capacity has been a pervasive issue across this inquiry, and our previous inquiries into Seafood and Meat Exports to the EU and the Labour in the Food Supply Chain.²⁴² The key question has been whether there would be enough Official Veterinarians (OVs) to carry out the extra certification work required following the end of the transition period. The Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) estimated that there was already a 12% shortfall in UK veterinary capacity in 2018.²⁴³

118. As suggested by RCVS and RSPCA, this shortfall could be exacerbated by the lack of mutual recognition of veterinary qualifications within the TCA.²⁴⁴ This is significant because the veterinary profession is heavily reliant on overseas graduates. RCVS said, “up to 60% of vets registering in recent years graduated overseas.”²⁴⁵ In “The UK’s new immigration policy and the food supply chain” inquiry, the Committee heard that 95% of official veterinarians who work in slaughterhouses qualified in the European Economic Area.²⁴⁶

237 [Q13](#) [James Russell]

238 [Q13](#) [James Russell]

239 [Q171](#) [Ian Hewitt]

240 [Q171](#) [Professor Middlemiss]

241 [Q171](#) [Ian Hewitt]

242 Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee, [Eighth Report: Seafood and meat exports to the EU](#), April 2021, Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee, [Third Report - The UK’s new immigration policy and the food supply chain](#), December 2020

243 Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons [[MAAB0009](#)]

244 Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons [[MAAB0009](#)], RSPCA [[MAAB0010](#)]

245 Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons [[MAAB0009](#)]

246 [[Q51](#)] Evidence taken as part of the Labour in the Food Supply Chain, HC 231, 15 September 2020

119. There are conflicting views and evidence on whether there are enough OVs. In a paper by Defra to RCVS, considered at its 18 March 2021 Council Meeting, Defra warned that it “currently anticipate[s] a severe shortage of OV capacity in abattoirs in England and Wales over the next 6–12 months”²⁴⁷. On this basis Defra asked the RCVS Council to amend its temporary register rules for 12 months to allow temporary registrants to carry out official veterinarian work in slaughterhouses. However, a week later during our Seafood and Meat Export inquiry, on the 25 March, David Kennedy, Director General for Food, Farming, Animal and Plant Health at Defra, told us that there is “enough capacity within the system.”²⁴⁸

120. On 20 April James Russell, President of the BVA said he was “concerned” when he heard Defra officials say “that there is no problem with veterinary capacity, particularly with the veterinary capacity that fills in behind those people who are signing export certificates.”²⁴⁹ The Ulster Farmers Union also warned the Committee about the impact of the Northern Ireland Protocol, “Our chief vet says that 20% of Europe’s certificates may need to take place at these two crossings, from Belfast and Larne, and it is just crazy. There is no way that there are enough vets in place to do that certification work.”²⁵⁰

121. On 18 May the Chief Veterinary Officer said, “it is fair to say that it is a fragile situation in terms of having the adequate resource to carry out all the checks necessary.”²⁵¹

122. There is disagreement between Defra, the veterinary sector, and the Chief Veterinary Officer about whether there are enough veterinarians to carry out the increase in certification work which is required following the transition period. Government should closely monitor veterinary capacity alongside projections of six-month demand and publish statistics on a quarterly basis.

247 Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons, [Council Meeting: Thursday, 18 March 2021](#), March 2021

248 [Q180] Evidence taken as part of the Seafood and Meat Exports to the EU, HC 1189, 25 March 2021

249 [Q5] James Russell

250 [Q6] Victor Chestnutt

251 [182] Professor Middlemiss

Conclusions and recommendations

Moving pets

1. The Committee sees the introduction of this new regulation as an important step in preventing pet smuggling and is pleased the Government has acted on our recommendation. (Paragraph 9)
2. We welcome the Government's commitment to ban the import of pets younger than six-months-old, heavily pregnant pets, and pets that have been subject to poor animal welfare practices. We recognise the argument that ministers should be able to adapt regulations as science and intelligence evolve. However, we see no future where the movement of young animals, heavily pregnant animals or the import of animals which have been subject to poor welfare practices is acceptable. The need to prevent pet smuggling is serious and urgent, introducing these bans through later secondary legislation will only create further delays, enabling this illicit trade to continue. (Paragraph 13)
3. The Bill should maintain the flexibility to allow ministers to adapt to future science and intelligence, but Defra should include a ban on animals younger than six months, heavily pregnant animals, and animals which have been subject to poor welfare practices on the face of the Bill, rather than secondary legislation. It should include a clear definition of 'heavily pregnant'. Putting these prohibitions in primary legislation would be a serious and sincere statement about the value the Government attaches to animal welfare. (Paragraph 13)
4. Currently pet smuggling is viewed as a low-risk and high reward crime. The UK must improve its deterrents against pet smuggling. (Paragraph 23)
5. The Government should increase the sentences given to pet smugglers, including greater consideration of custodial sentences. Increasing prosecution rates must also be a priority, as prosecution rates are proportionately low given the estimated size of the trade. The Government should make use of its full suite of investigatory and enforcement powers to pursue the money generated from pet smuggling. (Paragraph 23)
6. It is the carriers not APHA staff who carry out most checks on pets at the border. Therefore, Defra should ensure that there is a legal obligation for the individual checking the animal to "visualise" the animal, making sure it matches the paperwork and microchip presented. (Paragraph 24)
7. Moving the responsibility for checking pets at the border from carriers to a Government Agency will prevent the conflict of interests that is inherent within carriers checking the pets of their customers. (Paragraph 25)
8. The responsibility for checking pets at the border should be shifted from carriers to a Government Agency like APHA or Border Force to ensure smuggling is dealt with effectively. (Paragraph 25)

9. Within Defra's policies there is an increasing focus on the prevention of pet smuggling. However, this increased policy focus has not been matched by an increased prioritisation of the issue or increased funding within Border Force or APHA. Furthermore, we note above the need for responsibility for checking pets at borders to move from the carriers to Government agencies. (Paragraph 26)
10. Whichever of Border Force or APHA takes responsibility for checking pets must be properly resourced, and the Department should set out what steps it is taking within Government to ensure that this work is appropriately prioritised and resourced. (Paragraph 26)
11. It is unclear whether travellers have understood the requirements of the new pet travel regulation. There is a risk that as travellers wishing to take their pets abroad will be sent home at the border. (Paragraph 30)
12. Defra should continue its efforts to ensure travellers understand the new pet travel regulations. The current reduction in travel provides an opportunity to ensure no pet owner is turned back home at the border once travel increases. (Paragraph 30)
13. Regaining 'part 1 listed' under the EU's Pet Travel Scheme will make taking pets to the EU and Northern Ireland easier and less costly. (Paragraph 33)
14. The Government should engage with the EU and adopt a pragmatic stance in the pursuit of either 'Part 1 listed' status in the EU Pet Travel Scheme, or an arrangement which is as close to 'Part 1' status as is possible within the current political context environment. (Paragraph 33)
15. A number of non-endemic canine diseases are on the rise in the UK. These pose a serious health risk to the UK pet population. There is a particular risk from street animals being rehomed in the UK and dogs which have been smuggled in. Leaving the EU gives the UK an opportunity to introduce regulations that will provide increased protection for animal health and biosecurity, the Government should act on this opportunity. (Paragraph 40)
16. The Government should introduce pre-import screening for non-endemic diseases which threaten the UK pet population. This should be accompanied by the reinstatement of the UK's tick and tapeworm treatment requirements that existed before the UK joined PETS. The UK should also introduce the rabies titre test as a way of ensuring animals have valid rabies vaccinations and the animal's paperwork has not been forged. The UK's biosecurity is being threatened now and these changes need to be brought in as soon as possible. (Paragraph 40)

Moving horses

17. Britain is a leading player in the global equestrian market, which provides significant economic benefits to the UK. The Government must enable the expedited movement of 'high health status' horses across Europe to protect this industry. An agreement on high health status horses would benefit all parties involved and has been advocated by the British, Irish and French racing and breeding industries to the highest levels of the European Commission. (Paragraph 50)

18. The Government should work with the EU to formulate an agreement on ‘high health status’ horses as quickly as possible. This agreement should be based on a system which is digital by design and easy to use. The Government should adopt a pragmatic and practical stance in pursuit of this goal. (Paragraph 50)
19. We have been told that there are horses being illicitly moved across Britain’s borders and being sent to slaughter under the guise of being sold for other purposes. (Paragraph 55)
20. Defra should investigate non-compliant horse movements and quantify the scale and causes of the practice. This work should take place in collaboration with industry groups like World Horse Welfare who have developed intelligence and expertise on horse smuggling. Once the scale of the issue has been identified, Defra should set out a plan to address it within a year, and no later. (Paragraph 55)
21. The current system of equine ID is not fit for purpose. Its outdated and fragmented paper systems enable fraud. A digital identification system would help to prevent horse smuggling and enable the expedited movement of ‘high health status’ horses. The mandatory microchipping of equines facilitates a digital identification system, which we believe is available at the moment. Defra should move to this system as a matter of urgency. (Paragraph 63)
22. The proposals put forward in Defra’s upcoming equine identification consultation should be digital by design and easy to use, except in exceptional circumstances, such as the studbook network which is vital for the support of native, rare and indigenous breeds. It is our understanding that these systems already exist within the industry. The Government should embrace these systems or guarantee interoperability with them. Alongside this new identification system Defra should develop a funded action plan to enforce the identification rules. The consultation should be published within the next three months and the action plan should be published within three months of the consultation’s conclusion. (Paragraph 63)

Moving livestock

23. The current lack of border control posts approved to process live animal exports in European ports is an effective ban on the export of British livestock to mainland Europe. The Government’s strategy of incentivising the construction of border control posts by providing information on the value of the sector has not been successful. (Paragraph 74)
24. The Government must work more closely with the EU and commercial partners to ensure that border control posts capable of processing livestock are built immediately in Northern European ports. (Paragraph 74)
25. The Government must ensure border control posts capable of processing live animals are operational by March 2022. This date is an absolute deadline rather than a target. These posts should be geographically spread around the country and provide appropriate capacity to meet market demand to prevent overly long journey

times which endanger animal welfare. Defra should publish information relating to the location and capacity of specific border control posts by December 2021 to allow businesses to prepare for the March 2022 deadline. (Paragraph 75)

26. British breeding stock is an important export. We are concerned that the ban on export for slaughter and fattening has been interpreted as a ban on the export of all live animals, which may have led to EU partners not prioritising suitable border posts. This could damage the export of British breeding stock. (Paragraph 76)
27. Within a month of this report's publication Defra should provide a clear statement of support for the ongoing export of British breeding stock, emphasizing that these exports will not be affected by the ban on export for slaughter and fattening. (Paragraph 76)
28. The movement of agricultural animals between Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a practice that has existed for generations, has been disrupted by the Northern Ireland Protocol. The residency, scrapie and ear tagging requirements risk jeopardising the genetic integrity of Northern Irish breeding stock. Although it is a small number of farm businesses that are affected, these are often small, independent, family run business and the impact of the restrictions could be catastrophic. (Paragraph 87)
29. The Committee welcomes the agreement between the Government and the Commission on residency requirements and ear tagging. (Paragraph 88)
30. However, the Government should monitor the implementation of the new systems to make sure they are fit for purpose and fully enable the movement of livestock from Great Britain into Northern Ireland. It should review these arrangements within 12 months of their implementation and report back to this committee. (Paragraph 88)
31. Furthermore, we welcome that the Government is working on a solution to the scrapie requirements, but a solution must be found immediately. (Paragraph 89)
32. The Government should work with the EU to agree a derogation from the scrapie monitoring system, as quickly as possible. This derogation should provide adequate time for farmers to join the system. The Government should adopt a pragmatic and practical stance in pursuit of this goal. (Paragraph 89)
33. In the short-term Defra should extend the Movement Assistance Scheme to pay for scrapie testing. The new breeding season for sheep is about to start meaning the Government needs to find an immediate solution to allow breeding stock from Great Britain to enter into Northern Ireland. As such, the Movement Assistance Scheme should be extended for this purpose by October 2021. (Paragraph 90)
34. We welcome the ban on export for slaughter and fattening as an important step in protecting animal welfare. We understand that the number of animal movements this ban will affect is small, however, we are concerned that there may be unintended consequences. Particularly, that it may create longer journeys, which may increase costs for some UK farms and could have the unintended effect of worsening animal welfare. We are also concerned that this will prohibit the movement of livestock for breeding purposes. (Paragraph 108)

35. Defra should work with the organisations and businesses that will be affected by the ban on export for slaughter to ensure that the ban is introduced in a pragmatic way that will not adversely affect rural businesses or animal welfare. (Paragraph 108)
36. Supporting and bolstering the UK abattoirs network will benefit our food security and protect animal welfare. There is a direct link between the Government's current policy of limiting journey times between the farm and abattoirs, and the need for a network of small and medium abattoirs spread geographically around the UK. Equally, small abattoirs must be commercially viable businesses, capable of supporting themselves. (Paragraph 109)
37. Defra should take action to protect small and medium abattoirs as a national strategic asset. These businesses should be supported and bolstered through the Future Farming Resilience Fund. Defra should set out and enact its approach to funding the UK abattoirs network as a strategic national asset within six months. (Paragraph 109)
38. Heavy handed regulations can overburden small and medium abattoirs, preventing them from being successful commercial enterprises. (Paragraph 110)
39. Defra should establish a small working group to assess how effectively and fairly regulations are being applied in small and medium abattoirs. This group should ensure regulations are sensible and maintain food hygiene standards without overloading businesses. This group should be established by December 2021. (Paragraph 110)
40. The Government's proposals on 'Improvements to animal welfare in Transport' are well-meaning but flawed. They show a lack of understanding in how parts of the agricultural economy work and would have benefited from better co-design and consultation. (Paragraph 111)
41. We welcome that Defra is rethinking its proposals. Defra should ensure they work with the industry to develop its new proposals, making sure they protect animal welfare while being practical and realistic. It should publish the updated proposals by December 2021. (Paragraph 111)

Biosecurity

42. Diseases do not recognise borders. Enhancing biosecurity protects animal, plant and human health. Although we have full faith in the Chief Veterinary Officer, it would be easier to monitor animal diseases in our closest neighbours if the UK regained access to the Animal Disease Notification System. ADNS is a quick and reliable system, and it would help to remove the opportunity for human error. Regaining access to the ADNS would also benefit our European neighbours as it would allow them to better monitor disease in the UK. This is a win, win situation. Failing to regain access could have catastrophic consequences for UK biosecurity, so (Paragraph 117)
43. The Government should work with the EU to regain Britain's access to the ADNS as a matter of urgency Defra should update this committee on its efforts . (Paragraph 117)

44. There is disagreement between Defra, the veterinary sector, and the Chief Veterinary Officer about whether there are enough veterinarians to carry out the increase in certification work which is required following the transition period. (Paragraph 123)
45. Government should closely monitor veterinary capacity alongside projections of six-month demand and publish statistics on a quarterly basis. (Paragraph 123)

EMBARGOED ADVANCE NOTICE: Not to be published in full, or in part,
in any form before 00.01am on Thursday 30 September 2021

Formal minutes

Thursday 23 September

Members present

Neil Parish, in the Chair

Dr Neil Hudson

Robbie Moore

Mrs Sheryll Murray

Draft Report (*Moving animals across borders*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraphs 1 to 122 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the First Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available (Standing Order No. 134).

Adjournment

[Adjourned till Tuesday 19 October at 2.00 p.m.]

EMBARGOED ADVANCE NOTICE: Not to be published in full, or in part, in any form before 09.01am on Thursday, 30 September 2021

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Tuesday 20 April 2021

James Russell, President, British Veterinary Association (BVA); **Stuart Roberts**, Deputy President, National Farmers Union; **Victor Chestnutt**, President, Ulster Farmers' Union

[Q1-33](#)

Professor Tim Morris; **Mr James West**, Senior Policy Manager UK, Compassion in World Farming; **Malcolm Mitchell**, Professor of Physiology and Animal Welfare, Scottish Rural College

[Q34-53](#)

Tuesday 18 May 2021

Mr Ross Hamilton, Head of Public Affairs, British Horseracing Authority; **Roly Owers**, Chief Executive Officer, World Horse Welfare; **Jan Rogers**, Director of Research and Policy, The Horse Trust

[Q54-89](#)

Paula Boyden, Veterinary Director, Dogs Trust; **Maggie Roberts**, Director of Veterinary Services, Cats Protection; **David Bowles**, Head of Public Affairs and Campaigns, RSPCA

[Q90-123](#)

Tuesday 08 June 2021

Christine Middlemiss, Chief Veterinary Officer, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; **Ian Hewett**, interim Chief Executive, Animal and Plant Health Agency; **Steve Dann**, Director, National Operational Headquarters, Border Force

[Q124-188](#)

Tuesday 29 June 2021

Rt Hon The Lord Benyon, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; **Gareth Baynham Hughes**, Director of Animal and Plant Health, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs

[Q189-254](#)

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE: Not to be published in full, or in part, in any form before 09:00am on Thursday 30 September 2021

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

maab numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

- 1 Abattoirs Sector Group ([maab0071](#))
- 2 Aitkin, Miss Valerie ([maab0014](#))
- 3 Animal and Plant Health Agency ([maab0064](#))
- 4 Armstrong, Georgina (Rider, Gainfield Equestrian) ([maab0022](#))
- 5 Aviagen Group ([maab0043](#))
- 6 Battersea ([maab0045](#))
- 7 Bishop, Mr Alex (Rider, Sussex Equestrian Sales) ([maab0022](#))
- 8 Blue Cross ([maab0039](#))
- 9 British Association for Shooting and Conservation ([maab0026](#))
- 10 British Horse Council (BHC) ([maab0044](#))
- 11 British Horseracing Authority ([maab0067](#))
- 12 British Horseracing Authority ([maab0056](#))
- 13 British Veterinary Association (BVA) ([maab0063](#))
- 14 Buglife - The Invertebrate Conservation Trust ([maab0038](#))
- 15 Canine & Feline Sector Group; and RSPCA, Dogs Trust, Battersea, Cats Protection, BSAVA, Blue Cross, Kennel Club, Local Government Animal Welfare Group, PIF ([maab0036](#))
- 16 Carmichael, Tess (Rider, Hill Farm Equestrian) ([maab0022](#))
- 17 Carpenter, Amanda (Owner, Cats & Pipes) ([maab0022](#))
- 18 Cats Protection ([maab0059](#))
- 19 Cats Protection ([maab0031](#))
- 20 Chartered Trading Standards Institute ([maab0051](#))
- 21 City of London Corporation ([maab0047](#))
- 22 Cogent Breeding Ltd ([maab0052](#))
- 23 Compassion in World Farming ([maab0049](#))
- 24 Conservative Animal Welfare Foundation ([maab0035](#))
- 25 Countryside Alliance ([maab0050](#))
- 26 Defra ([maab0054](#))
- 27 Department for Environment Food and Rural Affairs ([maab0068](#))
- 28 Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs ([maab0066](#))
- 29 Dogs Trust ([maab0061](#))
- 30 Dogs Trust ([maab0048](#))
- 31 ESM Equestrian Ltd ([maab0006](#))
- 32 FOUR PAWS UK ([maab0032](#))

- 33 Gregg, Mr Roy (Proprietor Dog Boarding and Show Kennel's, Gregg's of Carryduff) ([maab0001](#))
- 34 Haurie, Ana ([maab0022](#))
- 35 Hulcoop, Miss Rachel ([maab0012](#))
- 36 International Mounted Games Association ([maab0029](#))
- 37 International Association of Vegan Sociologists ([maab0004](#))
- 38 Jackson, Miss Laura (Owner, Laura Shears Eventing) ([maab0022](#))
- 39 Kerner, Michael ([maab0065](#))
- 40 Lewis, Mrs Sarah (Owner, Sarah Lewis Show Jumping) ([maab0011](#))
- 41 Lewis, Mrs Sarah (Owner, Sarah Lewis Show Jumping) ([maab0022](#))
- 42 Loxton, Mr Mike ([maab0017](#))
- 43 Loxton, Mrs Samantha ([maab0041](#))
- 44 Loxton, Mrs Susan ([maab0016](#))
- 45 MSD Animal Health UK Limited ([maab0028](#))
- 46 Maher, Ms Kay ([maab0019](#))
- 47 National Farmers' Union ([maab0057](#))
- 48 National Pig Association ([maab0053](#))
- 49 National Sheep Association ([maab0027](#))
- 50 Ornamental Aquatic Trade Association ([maab0042](#))
- 51 Pawsey, Helen (Freelance Driver, Freelance Driver) ([maab0022](#))
- 52 Potter, Michael (Show Jumping Trainer, Lambley House Sport Horses) ([maab0022](#))
- 53 Potter, Zoe (Rider, Lambley House Sport Horses) ([maab0022](#))
- 54 Quality Meat Scotland ([maab0046](#))
- 55 RSPCA ([maab0010](#))
- 56 Rhodes-Mayfield, Miss Katie ([maab0013](#))
- 57 Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons ([maab0009](#))
- 58 Russell, Mrs Margaret ([maab0015](#))
- 59 Tempest, Dr Mike ([maab0003](#))
- 60 The Abattoir Sector Group ([maab0062](#))
- 61 The Abattoir Sector Group; and Sustainable Food Trust, Rare Breed Survival Trust, Fur Farm, Craft Butchers Association, AIMS, Small Abattoirs ([maab0021](#))
- 62 The Kennel Club ([maab0069](#))
- 63 The Kennel Club ([maab0030](#))
- 64 The Livestock Auctioneers Association Limited ([maab0020](#))
- 65 The Poultry Club of Great Britain ([maab0060](#))
- 66 The Poultry Club of Great Britain ([maab0033](#))
- 67 The Self Help Group for Farmers, Pet Owners and Others experiencing difficulties with the RSPCA (The SHG) ([maab0034](#))
- 68 Wildlife and Countryside Link ([maab0055](#))

- 69 Wilson, Mr Ian ([maab0003](#))
- 70 World Horse Welfare ([maab0070](#))
- 71 dream, End of a (Owner, Vega Solutions Ltd) ([maab0005](#))
- 72 walsh, miss fiona ([maab0037](#))

EMBARGOED ADVANCE NOTICE: Not to be published in full, or in part,
in any form before 00.01am on Thursday 30 September 2021

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the publications page of the Committee's website.

Session 2021-22

Number	Title	Reference
1st	Moving animals across borders	HC 79

Session 2019-21

Number	Title	Reference
1st	COVID-19 and food supply	HC 263
2nd	Pre-appointment hearing for the Chair-Designate of the Office for Environmental Protection (OEP)	HC 1042
3rd	The UK's new immigration policy and the food supply chain	HC 231
4th	Flooding	HC 170
5th	Air Quality and coronavirus: a glimpse of a different future or business as usual	HC 468
6th	Public Sector Procurement of Food	HC 469
7th	Covid-19 and the issues of security in food supply	HC 1156
8th	Seafood and meat exports to the EU	HC 1189

EMBARGOED ADVANCE NOTICE: Not to be published in full, or in part, in any form before 00.01am on Thursday 30 September 2021