

MAINTAINING OR IMPROVING FARM ANIMAL WELFARE IN THE LIGHT OF INCREASING TRADE LIBERALISATION AND GLOBALISATION: A CONTRADICTION IN TERMS?

ADVICE FOR THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE,
NATURE AND FOOD QUALITY CONCERNING
STRATEGIC OPTIONS FOR DEALING WITH THE
APPARENT CONTRADICTION BETWEEN
LIBERALISATION, GLOBALISATION AND FARM
ANIMAL WELFARE

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

- prof. C.J.G. Wensing, chairman
- A. Achterkamp
- I. Arendzen
- A.M. Burger
- E.C. Greve
- M.J.B. Jansen
- S.B.M. Jongerius
- J.Th. de Jongh
- P.J.J.M. Loonen
- B.J. Odink
- dr. H. Paul
- G. de Peuter
- prof. A. Pijpers
- T. de Ruijter
- S.J. Schenk
- prof. F.J. van Sluijs
- H.W.A. Swinkels
- P.A. Thijsse
- prof. J.H.M. Verheijden
- P. van der Wal

Council for Animal Affairs

address:

Laan van Nieuw Oost Indië 131-133
2593 BM The Hague
The Netherlands

mailing address:

P.O. Box 90428
2509 LK The Hague
The Netherlands

telephone +31 70 3785266

facsimile + 31 70 3786336

email info@rda.nl

www.raadvoordierenaangelegenheden.nl

Secretary: dr. I.D. de Wolf

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Recommendations	5
Background report	11
1. Introduction	11
2. Animal welfare in an international context	15
3. How to maintain or improve farm animal welfare in the light of increasing trade liberalisation and globalisation?	18
4. Conclusions	28
References	33
Appendices	35
1. Overview of agricultural trade by the Netherlands and EU	35
2. List of contributors	37
3. Overview of publications	38

RECOMMENDATIONS

In this report, written at the request of the Director of Trade and Industry of the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, insight is given in the relationship between trade liberalisation and globalisation on the one hand and animal welfare on the other. Several strategic options are presented which may all be helpful in dealing with the apparent contradiction between liberalisation/globalisation and animal welfare. The direct and indirect costs of these options are not discussed here. Furthermore, this report assigns responsibilities to all stakeholders involved. This report may help determine the strategy to be followed by the Dutch government in the WTO negotiations on agriculture.

Trade liberalisation can be defined as "opening local markets to foreign goods by removing barriers to exports and imports". Globalisation is a comprehensive term for "the emergence of a global society in which economic, political, environmental, and cultural events in one part of the world quickly come to have significance for people in other parts of the world". Although the terms mean different things, in spoken language the two terms are often interchanged: (trade) liberalisation is used where globalisation is meant and v.v.

Animal welfare has been defined in various ways. Most definitions agree that good welfare occurs when animals are in harmony with themselves and their environment. However, some definitions emphasise that there always will be challenges to animals in any environment and that good welfare occurs when animals are able to cope with these challenges. Dispute still exists as to whether welfare should be defined ultimately in terms of feelings only - i.e. emotional states such as hunger, pain, fear, frustration, and pleasure that animals experience - or (more directly measurable) in terms of biological functioning such as survival, normal behaviour, physiology, and (re-) productive success. It is generally agreed that feelings are an important part of the concept of welfare.

An animal's welfare is sensitive to many different factors acting on various time scales for which there is no simple, objectively measurable common currency. Moreover, scientific knowledge about animals' subjective states - key elements in animal welfare - is imperfect. However, a broad consensus basis exists among welfare scientists concerning the assessment of (farm) animal welfare.

The interest in animal welfare differs strongly between countries and regions. E.g. whereas animal

welfare is seen as a major non-trade concern by many western European countries, such as the Scandinavian countries and the UK, the interest in animal welfare is limited in countries such as the US.

Trade liberalisation and globalisation may have a limited, but positive effect on animal welfare in some cases, e.g. export of live cattle to the Middle East may decrease due to the termination of export restitution and the process of trade liberalisation and globalisation may open the possibility for a discussion on internationally accepted standards on farm animal welfare. However, many people feel that the positive consequences of trade liberalisation and globalisation are overshadowed by the expected negative consequences of trade liberalisation and globalisation for animal welfare. The most important negative consequence seems to be change in competitiveness. A competitive disadvantage may have considerable economic consequences for farmers, but also for the processing industry, regardless which market they supply.

In dealing with increasing trade liberalisation and globalisation, several strategies can be followed with regard to animal welfare:

1. Easing legislation in the area of animal welfare in the EU; although from an economic point of view this might be an attractive strategy, from an animal welfare, societal and political point of view this option does not seem to be realistic and is not explored further in this report;
2. Business as usual: no easing or more stringent legislation on animal welfare in the Netherlands and/or the EU, no initiatives within the chain (i.e. livestock industry, processing industry, supermarkets and consumers) to improve farm animal welfare. This so-called "zero option" seems to be the most realistic option, given the political climate in the Netherlands and the different points of view within the EU concerning the interest of animal welfare. Several initiatives could be taken here: in the WTO and EU framework and in the field of bilateral agreements, a voluntary code of practice, informing and educating consumers and investments in innovative research;
3. Improving animal welfare by more stringent legislation in the Netherlands and/or the EU or on the initiative of the chain. The additional efforts that are suggested in this option, the so-called "plus option", are warmly welcomed by the Council, but will probably be on a voluntary basis and on the initiative of non-governmental stakeholders (and under pressure of the public opinion and NGOs and supported by the Dutch government), given the current political climate in the Netherlands. The Council would like to point out that producing in accordance with more stringent animal welfare standards will not necessarily increase production or processing costs, especially if appropriate cost-containing techno-

logies can be found. Furthermore, improved animal welfare is often synonymous with increased productivity, enhanced product quality and greater unit profitability. Investment in innovative research, at the initiative of the agricultural sector and probably supported by the Dutch government and/or EU, will be necessary.

Within the zero option, a major step could be made if animal welfare were put on the WTO agenda. Ideally, the WTO would encourage and support the development of internationally acknowledged farm animal welfare standards. The application of other WTO related instruments, i.e. the admission of animal welfare in the green box, restricted demolition of tariffs, and/or a change of WTO regulations and their interpretation, however, should also be a point of focus. The Dutch Product Boards for Livestock, Meat and Eggs are not very optimistic about the attainability of putting animal welfare on the WTO agenda, although the reluctance of many major non-EU countries in putting non-trade concerns on the WTO agenda seems to have a mainly negotiation-technical character. Nevertheless, even when succeeding in putting animal welfare on the WTO agenda, this strategy will only produce an effect in the long run, thus other strategies for dealing with the tense relationship between liberalisation/globalisation and animal welfare standards in the EU, and more specifically the Netherlands, should be followed as well in the meanwhile.

The Council remarks that it is of uttermost importance that the EU operates as one when putting animal welfare on the WTO agenda. Efforts may fail if the different EU countries all speak for themselves and not with one voice. Another option for getting animal welfare on the agenda is that the Netherlands forms a coalition with like-minded EU partners and third countries. In order to ease the path for WTO standards on animal welfare, the EU or the coalition could prepare welfare standards in advance, thereby facilitating the discussion.

The Council for Animal Affairs is of the opinion that all parties involved (i.e. Dutch government and/or EU, all organisations within the chain, NGOs and Dutch and/or European society) have their own responsibility in dealing with animal welfare and could all contribute in their own way to this process by making use of the means at their disposal.

The Council recommends following the next tracks for dealing with farm animal welfare in the light of increasing trade liberalisation and globalisation:

Short-term

Track 1: providing information to increase consumer awareness by all stakeholders involved (i.e. Dutch government, the chain, NGOs etc.) (preferably in combination with track 2).

- Track 2: starting consultation about voluntary labelling of products of which the relation with animal welfare is obvious; branding might be an alternative; chain initiatives, for instance under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the Dutch government (preferably in combination with track 1).
- Track 3: investigating the feasibility and if possible realising an obligatory indication of the country or region of origin on the packaging of meat within the Netherlands or the EU; initiative for a study on feasibility has already been announced by the EU (preferably in combination with track 1).
- Track 4: starting consultation about a voluntary code of practice as a consequence of which supermarkets will only sell products produced in accordance with specific animal welfare standards (link to Eurep-GAP?) and the processing industry will only use products produced in accordance with specific animal welfare standards; initiative by the supermarkets and/or processing industry, probably under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the Dutch government.
- Track 5: bilateral negotiations on production in accordance with EU animal welfare standards with the most important exporting countries; Dutch government initiatives under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the chain.
- Track 6: enforcing changes in the structure of Common Agricultural Policy payments, thereby making subsidies conditional on compliance with EU sustainability, including animal welfare; Dutch government initiatives under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the chain.
- Track 7: placing animal welfare on the WTO agenda and starting with the development of standards on farm animal welfare in the WTO or IOE (in which case the IOE standards should be obligatory); Dutch government initiatives under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the chain.
- Track 8: investment in innovative research to maintain animal welfare while decreasing production costs; sector initiatives, maybe supported by the Dutch government and/or the EU.
- Medium-term
- Track 1: realising branding or voluntary labelling of products of which the relation with animal welfare is obvious (continuation of track 2, short-term)

Track 2: realising a voluntary code of practice as a consequence of which supermarkets will sell only products that are produced in accordance with specific animal welfare standards (link to Eurep-GAP?) and the processing industry will only use products that are produced in line with specific animal welfare standards (continuation of track 4, short-term).

Track 3: realising a change in the structure of Common Agricultural Policy payments (continuation of track 6, short-term).

Track 4: development of welfare standards (by the WTO or IOE) and a discussion within the WTO on WTO-regulations and their interpretation and financial instruments (continuation of track 7, short-term; scientists can play a major role in developing standards on animal welfare in this phase).

Track 5: investment in innovative research to maintain animal welfare while decreasing production costs (continuation of track 8, short-term).

If not successfully completed in the short-term, tracks 1, 3 and 5 should be continued in the medium-term as well.

Long-term

Track 1: anchoring of farm animal welfare within the WTO (continuation track 4, medium-term).

Track 2: working out and realising the plus option, which is a responsibility of all stakeholders.

BACKGROUND REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

The three main concepts in this paper on the relationship between trade liberalisation and globalisation on the one hand and animal welfare on the other are trade liberalisation, globalisation and animal welfare.

1.1. Trade liberalisation

Liberalisation means “to reform and become less strict, or to reform something and make it less strict”. Trade liberalisation then means “opening local markets to foreign goods by removing barriers to exports and imports” (1).

In the discussion on animal welfare, trade liberalisation cannot be seen apart from globalisation. Although the terms mean different things, in spoken language the two terms are often interchanged: (trade) liberalisation is used where globalisation is meant and v.v.

1.2. Globalisation

Globalisation can be described as “1) the process by which social institutions become adopted on a global scale, and 2) the process by which a business or

company becomes international or starts operating on an international level”. Globalisation is a comprehensive term for “the emergence of a global society in which economic, political, environmental, and cultural events in one part of the world quickly come to have significance for people in other parts of the world”. It also involves the growth of multinational and transnational corporations (1).

1.3. Animal welfare

1.3.1. Definition of animal welfare

Animal welfare has been defined in various ways. Most definitions agree that good welfare occurs when animals are in harmony with themselves and their environment. However, some definitions emphasise that there always will be challenges to animals in any environment and that good welfare occurs when animals are able to cope with these challenges. Whether welfare should be defined ultimately in terms of feelings only - i.e. emotional states such as hunger, pain, fear, frustration, and pleasure that animals experience - or (more directly measurable) in terms of biological functioning such as survival, normal behaviour, physiology, and (re-)productive success, is still a moot point. It is generally agreed that feelings are an important part of the concept of welfare (2).

Prof. B. Spruijt, for instance, has given a definition, which emphasises the challenges to animals and their ability to cope with these challenges. He defines animal welfare as “the perspective of the animal to be able to cope with a specific situation, the balance between positive and negative factors”. According to him, this does not necessarily mean the animal has to be free of any kind of stress, however it does mean that the animal has to have the prospect of improvement (3).

According to Giffroy and Beaufays (4), animal welfare is “a balance at a specific moment of the attempts of the organism to adapt itself to its surroundings on the physiological, medical field and in the area of behaviour; these attempts may be efficient or inefficient; they may be heavy or not. Animal welfare refers to several concepts such as stress, sorrow or harm”. This definition also emphasises the challenges to animals and their ability to cope with these challenges. In addition to the first definition, the definition of Giffroy and Beaufays includes feelings, such as sorrow or harm, as well.

Lastly, the Brambell commission (5) defined (farm) animal welfare by means of five freedoms that express mainly the absence of negative states, i.e.:

- Freedom from hunger and thirst by ready access to fresh water and a diet to maintain full health and vigour;
- Freedom from discomfort by providing an appropriate environment including shelter and a comfortable resting area;

- Freedom from pain, injury or disease by prevention or rapid diagnosis and treatment;
- Freedom to express normal behaviour by providing sufficient space, proper facilities and company of the animal's own kind;
- Freedom from fear and distress by ensuring conditions and treatment that avoid mental suffering.

Critics remark that the absence of negative states as formulated by the Brambell commission is unthinkable in nature, and therefore put this definition of animal welfare up for debate.

1.3.2. Assessment of animal welfare

An animal's welfare is dependent on many different factors acting on various time scales for which there is no simple, objectively measurable common currency. Moreover, scientific knowledge about animals' subjective states - key elements in animal welfare - is imperfect. However, a broad consensus exists among welfare scientists concerning the assessment of (farm) animal welfare. Increased mortality or sudden drops in production, for instance, are generally believed to indicate reduced welfare, even if no further evidence is available about how the animals feel prior to death or during a period of reduced growth. Most scientists accept that there are no major welfare problems when there is low mortality, low morbidity, little or no risk of injury, good body condition (sustaining adequate production and reproduction), the ability to perform species-specific activities (including social interactions, exploration

and play), and the absence of abnormal behaviour and physiological signs of stress, including suppression of immune responses. A complete assessment of (farm) animal welfare must take account of short-term information obtained from individual animals, but it should also integrate information over longer periods of time (months or years) and information about groups of animals (unit, herd, or system level) to cover intensity, duration and incidence of any welfare-related condition. Given this complexity, welfare cannot be assessed with absolute certainty (2).

1.3.3. Developments in animal welfare

Since the 1960s, once anthropocentrism had been rejected, movements have developed to the advantage of animals. Initially, these movements were limited to the Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon countries, but they rapidly spread to all wealthy and urbanised countries. Under the pressure of public opinion, animal welfare laws were drawn up, which had to balance social, economic, cultural and political requirements (4). The extent to which governments chose to respond to these concerns varies according to cultural and social values and political systems. In Switzerland, animals have been recognised as "beings" rather than "things" since 1992. On May 17, 2002, the German Bundestag, voted "to give animals constitutional rights". The amendment will add the words "and animals" to a clause in the German constitution that requires the state to

respect and protect the dignity of "life". Consequently, Article 20a of the German constitution will read: "The state takes responsibility for protecting the natural foundations of life and animals in the interest of future generations" (6, 7). In other wealthy and urbanised countries, such as the Netherlands, animals don't (yet) have constitutional rights, although the issue is being discussed in some of these countries. Since the Treaty of Amsterdam (in force since May 1st, 1999), countries of the European Union are obliged to take full account of animal welfare when formulating and implementing Community legislation (8). The search for cheaper food and greater economic efficiency is no longer accepted as the sole standard against which policy choices should be measured (9).

Elsewhere in the world, where the average standard of living is (much) lower and/or the number of farmers is higher, the interest for animal welfare remains limited (4).

1.4. The problem

Animal welfare is of increasing significance for European consumers and citizens (10, 11). The activities of consumer groups and animal protectionists and, more recently, the effects of crises such as swine fever, BSE, foot-and-mouth disease and avian influenza, have put animal production in the spotlights. Issues such as animal welfare, food quality,

food safety and the environment have become much more important for the public. The calls for stricter regulation on welfare in animal production are growing and recommendations of the Council of Europe and EU Directives are becoming increasingly stringent (12). In other countries/regions in the world (e.g. China, Thailand), however, animal welfare is less of a 'hot' topic, if at all. In such countries animal welfare standards are often much more relaxed.

Some producers feel that meeting animal welfare standards works in their favour, as the stress created by poor treatment can lower the price of the product, and thus becomes an incentive to alter their practices (9), yet many European, and particularly Dutch producers, are concerned about the impact differences in animal welfare standards may have on international competition. They fear that easier welfare standards may result in lower production costs and lower product prices. Since the processing industry, supermarkets and most consumers may not be willing to pay more for products produced in accordance with more stringent standards and products produced in accordance with less strict standards are coming on the market as a result of the liberalisation and globalisation process, these producers fear that this will result in a competitive disadvantage and even the bankruptcy of the domestic (i.e. the Dutch and European) livestock industry. Currently, the export of Dutch meat and dairy products amounts to an annual €5 and € 3.9

thousand million. Meat and dairy products are also major imports. Most of the imported goods are used for consumption or industrial use (see also tables 1 and 2, appendix 1 for a more detailed overview of Dutch and European agricultural trade; 13).

The three main questions that arise are:

1. What is the impact of trade liberalisation and globalisation on animal welfare?
2. What possibilities do the Netherlands and the EU have to maintain or raise animal welfare in the light of trade liberalisation and globalisation?
3. Who should take responsibility for what?

These questions are the main topics of this study.

1.5. Delimitation

This study focuses on trade liberalisation, i.e. the opening of the domestic market to foreign goods by removing barriers to exports and imports. Liberalisation in the sense of less regulation is not being considered here.

The focus of this report is on farm animals and products from farm animals (i.e. meat, eggs, milk etc.). The processing industry, processing products in which ingredients originating from farm animals are used (e.g. eggs in shampoo and cake) is considered only in passing. Fish kept for production purposes and household pets are not taken into

account, although some of the consequences as described for the welfare of farm animals may also apply to these animals.

This study focuses only on animal welfare, although much of what is written down in this study also applies to other non-trade concerns.

The direct and indirect costs of the suggested options are beyond the scope of this report.

2. ANIMAL WELFARE IN AN INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

2.1. Influence of trade liberalisation and globalisation on animal welfare

2.1.1. Positive consequences of trade liberalisation and globalisation on farm animal welfare

According to some, trade liberalisation and globalisation may have a limited, but positive effect on animal welfare in some cases. For example, the termination of export restitutions for the export of live cattle to the Middle East, under the WTO-agreement which calls a halt to subsidising agricultural products, may have a positive effect on animal welfare. Export of live cattle to the Middle East not only implies long journey times, but the handling of animals is also subject to less stringent rules. Live cattle exports to the Middle East are expected to decrease due to the

termination of export restitutions (14). However, some point out that this might mean that other countries, particularly Australia, would step in, which would result in even longer journey times (15). Furthermore, trade liberalisation and globalisation may result in the import of products that are produced in accordance with less strict standards than those formulated by the EU. Since many EU countries are, for several reasons, reluctant to import these products, the process of trade liberalisation and globalisation opens the possibility for a discussion on internationally accepted animal welfare standards. Such standards might initially be less strict than the current EU welfare standards but for many other countries with no animal welfare standards at all, this is quite a big step.

2.1.2. Negative consequences of trade liberalisation and globalisation on farm animal welfare

Many people feel that the positive consequences of trade liberalisation and globalisation are overshadowed by the expected negative consequences for animal welfare.

Recommendations of the Council of Europe and EU Directives are becoming increasingly stringent. Already they are more stringent than those in other parts of the world (12). This does not only apply to countries such as China and Thailand, but also to wealthy, western countries like the US.

Where standards between the home and exporting country differ, imports may face trade restrictions. These may be necessary both to avoid disadvantaging domestic producers subject to higher standards and to reassure consumers about product quality, especially where animal welfare aspects are concerned. The application of higher standards on import might be justified when viewed from a food safety or animal welfare perspective, but may also lead to non-tariff trade barriers and protectionism (9), and are thus carefully scrutinised by the WTO.

By lifting trade restrictions, third country products can be sold cheaper on the EU market than the usually more expensive EU products that are produced in accordance with EU recommendations and directives. This results in trade distortion (14). Trade distortion might have two consequences, namely: 1) stimulation of production and import of products that do not meet European animal welfare standards, but which are demanded because they are cheaper, and 2) pressure by farmers and their organisations on the government a) to either relax animal welfare legislation or not to develop new and/or more stringent legislation, b) to protect the domestic market against products that do not meet EU standards, and/or c) financially compensate them for the higher production costs they have due to the more stringent EU legislation. In the Netherlands the latter happens at regular intervals.

2.2. Animal welfare and the global playing field

2.2.1. The global playing field

As noted in § 1.3.3., more and more protests are being made on ethical grounds against production practices which may cause unnecessary pain and suffering to farm animals. The search for cheaper food and greater economic efficiency is no longer accepted as the sole standard against which policy choices should be measured. Animal welfare is already an important area of public concern in the EU and it is likely to become increasingly important in other industrialised countries as well (9).

Currently, countries can only legitimately restrict imports if the products pose a health risks to consumers, which can be scientifically demonstrated. The Codex Alimentarius is taken as the standard to be used for such decisions. Current international agreements in the WTO dealing with standards exclusively address products or processes that leave physical traces. They do not address factors that leave no tangible effect on a product, such as animal welfare. At present, animal welfare standards could possibly be justified by appealing to article XX (a) of the GATT, which deals generally with exceptions to the agreement and permits the restriction of trade for ethical or cultural reasons. However, the wording, if not the interpretation of article XX is ambiguous and this could give rise to controversy if it were invoked to justify the restriction of trade for animal welfare

reasons. It is expected to have a greater chance of being invoked for goods produced by child or slave labour or for environmentally dangerous goods or production processes that endanger a given species. And even these might not meet with much success, as the US-Mexico tuna-dolphin case attests (9).

International agreements that aim to promote freer agricultural trade are seen by some as an impediment to addressing social concerns, such as animal welfare. There is a question as to the extent to which such agreements could and should acknowledge differences in values and beliefs among countries. According to some, these agreements should not undermine the primacy of domestic objectives, whereas others argue that the new concerns are essentially a subterfuge for those who wish to protect their domestic agriculture from international competition (9).

Until recently, most countries have used a voluntary, market approach to ensure farm animal welfare. However, in order to address concerns like animal welfare, the general public now often looks to the government for regulations. Trade conflicts associated with animal welfare standards have not yet arisen, probably in part because only a limited number of countries have introduced binding regulations for animal welfare, and thus the share of trade affected has been quite limited. However, given the importance of trade in livestock products, emerging differences in regulations and the absence of internationally acknowledged standards, an interna-

tional conflict over domestic policies might easily arise under present international agreements. Especially the unilateral imposition of welfare-based production standards for imports from third countries could be a source of conflict (9).

2.2.2. Economic aspects

Europe has chosen to raise welfare standards through regulating production processes. Where welfare standards are in place, consumers know they buy a product, which meets these standards. If such markets would be opened to animal products from countries with more relaxed standards, consumers would not be able to make an informed choice. Where domestic production costs are higher than those in the third country (although this may not necessarily be the case, as is shown in Ch. 3.2), animal production could be driven overseas and domestic producers might be out of business. If animal welfare standards aim to satisfy consumer concerns over animal welfare, this would undermine the purpose of the regulation. Furthermore, if producers are also exporters and cost-efficient animal welfare preserving technologies are not available, they would have to compete in markets with lower-cost producers. This could seriously affect their profits (9). The importing country may also face loss of profits if the imported product cannot be distinguished from the product produced domestically under given standards. It has been shown that in cases like this, trade liberalisation may lower consumer welfare

unless outweighed by positive benefits of product diversity (15).

3. HOW TO MAINTAIN OR IMPROVE ANIMAL WELFARE IN THE LIGHT OF INCREASING TRADE LIBERALISATION AND GLOBALISATION

There are several strategies that can be followed with regard to animal welfare in a world of increasing globalisation and trade liberalisation:

1. Easing animal welfare legislation in the EU; although from an economic point of view this might be an attractive strategy, it does not seem realistic from an animal welfare, societal and political point of view and is not further explored in this report;
2. Business as usual: no reduction or tightening up of legislation in the Netherlands and/or EU, no initiatives within the chain (i.e. livestock industry, processing industry, supermarkets and consumers) to improve farm animal welfare. Several initiatives could be taken here: in the WTO and EU framework and in the field of bilateral agreements, a voluntary code of practice, informing and educating consumers and investments in innovative research. This so-called "zero option" will be worked out in detail in § 3.1;
3. Improving animal welfare by more stringent legislation in the Netherlands and/or EU or on the initiative of the chain. In § 3.2 this option, the

so-called "plus option", will be worked out.

3.1. The zero option

Within this option, there are several possibilities for dealing with distortion of competition arising as a result of differences in animal welfare standards at national, EU and global level. It should be remembered that the acceptance of the necessity for animal welfare measures differs greatly throughout the world and that prevailing notions in rich countries are often perceived as ways of imposing trade barriers.

3.1.1. WTO

It is evident that the importance attached to animal welfare varies among WTO members. At the moment, all WTO members have the right to choose their own animal welfare standards, adapted to their own circumstances. The existing WTO agreements, (the Agreement of the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT), article XX of GATT, and article 20 of the Agreement on Agriculture), would however, seem to provide a basis on which some of the animal welfare issues can be discussed within the WTO framework (16). Possibilities within the WTO framework option are:

1. Recognition of multilateral standards on animal welfare by the WTO: this would require international core animal welfare standards that have a scientific basis and are acknowledged within the

WTO. The same route could be followed as that used for IOE (International Office of Epizootics) standards on animal health, which can now be enforced multilaterally by the WTO/SPS-agreement. Products that do not meet IOE, Codex or IPPC (=International Plant Protection Convention) standards can be refused on the basis of the SPS agreement. Although this probably could not be realised in the short-term, it would set the process of developing international animal welfare standards in motion. Some fear that developing international animal welfare standards may lead to them being set at the lowest common denominator or result in a meaningless compromise. Others point out that an internationally acknowledged standard on animal welfare would always be an improvement on the current situation and that in time this standard could be improved by new negotiations (17).

The IOE identified animal welfare as a priority in the 2001-2005 IOE Strategic Plan: IOE member countries decided that, as the international reference organisation for animal health and zoonoses, the IOE should also provide international leadership on animal welfare (16). In drafting the standards the Netherlands should play a prominent.

2. Exemption from WTO subsidy disciplines by admission of animal welfare in the green box: green box payments are defined as domestic

support that is minimally trade distorting or non-trade distorting and independent of production; it is the interface for addressing internal support schemes geared to societal goals. It does not specifically address animal welfare. Admission of animal welfare in the green box would mean that EU subsidies to welfare-friendly businesses could be excluded from subsidy disciplines and reduction obligations, thereby opening the possibility to make animal welfare conditions on existing subsidy flows. According to the EU, animal welfare payments would typically be non-trade distorting. The green box is not limited or subject to reductions, thereby allowing the EU to allocate support for animal welfare in addition to its support for other purposes. Expectations are positive about the feasibility of this option, although especially the Cairns countries, i.e. Australia, New Zealand, Canada, Brazil and Thailand, raise objections (17). Whether the EU will make subsidies available for welfare-friendly businesses (i.e. farmers) is questionable (15).

3. Restricted demolition of tariffs for products of animal origin (meat, eggs and live animals), lower than average tariff reductions, could be carried through. One possibility may be found in the system of reduction of tariffs on import. Although lower than average tariff reductions for products of animal origin should be compensated by a higher reduction on other products, distortion of competition by countries that have less

strict animal welfare standards could be slowed down in this way. Negotiations on this point have not yet started (17).

Another possibility may be found in GATT article XXVIII, which states that in exceptional cases already concluded tariff bonds may be raised if these are compensated elsewhere. Renegotiation of tariffs could also start for products of animal origin. Southern EU states may want agricultural products from northern EU states to be used in order to compensate (17).

4. Change of WTO regulations and their interpretation: another option would be a redrafting of WTO regulations, e.g. article XX of GATT or SPS agreement, to include animal welfare for ethical reasons. Another point is that the EU may need to challenge the interpretation of the WTO rules in order to advocate a more balanced relationship between trade liberalisation and non-trade concerns such as animal welfare (16).

Resistance of the US and the Cairns groups against anchoring animal welfare in new WTO legislation seems to have mainly a strategic character.

An option that goes further would be to strive within the WTO for the possibility of preventing products not produced in accordance with the prevailing legislation in that country from entering the market and/or introducing import measures in the form of quotas or higher tariffs for products that do not take account of

animal welfare. In this way, the EU is able to control the volume of imports and prevent the undercutting of domestic producers in the EU home market. At the moment, the WTO does not allow such a distinction and it is highly unlikely that this will change in the near to medium-term, since this would demand a complete review of the international trade law (17). However, representatives of the Dutch livestock industry stress the necessity of import measures in the form of increased tariffs for products that do not take account of animal welfare. According to them this would offer the best protection against these imports (15).

The Dutch government, with or without a coalition of like-minded partners, and the EU are the designated institutions to place animal welfare on the WTO agenda. However, the public and especially NGOs (i.e. animal welfare organisations, consumer organisations etc.) and chain organisations can put pressure on the Dutch government and the EU to put this topic on the WTO agenda. Many of these institutions do have an international network and should make an appeal to this network to put the EU under pressure.

3.1.2. The European Union

Within the EU, another option would be a change in agricultural policy to allow products, which meet animal welfare standards to be subsidised. In this way, products produced in accordance with specific

animal welfare standards would be encouraged and could result in a greater supply and lower product prices. The improved availability of these products and the smaller price differences between products that meet specific animal welfare standards and those that do not, may eventually result in a higher demand, thus stimulating production in keeping with these standards. This option links up with the changes to Common Agricultural Policy payments proposed by the European Commission. The proposal is that farmers' subsidies, especially in the cattle sector and to a lesser extent the pig, poultry and egg sectors, will be made conditional on compliance with EU issues of sustainability, including animal welfare. There might be a possibility within Rural Development to grant subsidies for new investments. This is only possible for investments that provide extra (more than national and EU legislation) animal welfare and not to compensate for existing differences in legislation on animal welfare between the EU and third countries (15). Changes in EU subsidy policy will be subject to the disciplines imposed by the rules of the WTO.

Subsidising welfare friendly production methods, however, is subject to criticism. Given the recent budgetary problems, the slow growth in most EU economies, rising poverty and the lack of sufficient resources for health care, education etc., paying farmers for doing what they ought to do anyway cannot be justified. Critics also tell us to be careful not to subsidise EU animal production under the

guise of animal welfare, when actual costs of production might be contained through reorganisation and the adoption of new technologies (18).

Primarily, the responsibility for putting this option on the EU agenda lies with the Dutch Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, perhaps supported by other EU countries that are of the same opinion. However, public opinion, and especially NGOs and chain organisations, can put pressure on the Minister to place this topic on the EU agenda. Many of these institutions do have an international network and should make an appeal to this network to put the EU under pressure.

Representatives of the Dutch livestock industry also stress the necessity of import measures in the form of increased tariffs for products not produced in accordance with animal welfare standards within the EU. They see this as the best protection from these imports (15). Currently, the average agricultural import tariff within the EU is below 10%, whereas in Brazil it is 30% and in developed countries on average 60% (19). It is questionable whether the option of import measures in the form of increased tariffs is feasible, since this would require a complete review of international trade law. At the moment, the WTO does not allow such a distinction and it is highly unlikely that this will change in the near to medium term (17). Alternatively, the EU could choose to ignore the international trade law, thereby risking WTO penalties. Whether this approach is rea-

listic is also highly questionable.

3.1.3. Bilateral agreements

The third option is to conclude bilateral agreements on minimum animal welfare standards with the most important suppliers of products of animal origin (i.e. Brazil, Thailand, China, and the US). The EU already concluded bilateral agreements on minimum animal welfare standards at the end of the 1990s. This process may have a positive effect, perhaps making other processes regarding animal welfare (such as international harmonisation and WTO negotiations) easier (17).

Primarily, the responsibility for concluding bilateral agreements lies with the Dutch Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality. However, public opinion, and especially NGOs and chain organisations, can put pressure on the Minister to conclude these bilateral agreements. NGOs and chain organisations can facilitate this process by convincing their foreign counterparts of the importance of Dutch and/or EU animal welfare standards.

3.1.4. Voluntary code of practice

In this option, all or some of the players within the chain voluntarily agree to follow a specific code of practice. An example of such a voluntary code of practice is that all players within the chain agree not to produce, use or sell products that do not meet a specific standard. Supermarkets have introduced

Eurep-GAP (= good agricultural practice). Animal welfare could be a component of Eurep-GAP. Adopting a voluntary code of practice may, especially in combination with labelling, improve the 'green or social' image of the players involved (18).

The value of a voluntary code of practice increases if trade and industry are submitted to inspections by an independent body. In this way, standards can be enforced and credibility and consumer confidence increased. This option would probably start at national level, and later on, if successful, perhaps expand to international level, and could be combined with labelling, for recognition purposes.

The main responsibility for reaching a voluntary code of practice lies within the chain, whether or not under pressure from or supported by NGOs, the Dutch government and public opinion.

3.1.5. Informing and educating consumers

The purpose of informing and educating consumers is to build consumer awareness and confidence. Increased consumer awareness and confidence is thought to result in consumers taking responsibility and buying those products that meet certain animal welfare standards. Putting a price on farm animal welfare may however only be successful in the market for fresh meat (20). Critics point out that many consumers will not buy products that meet animal welfare standards as long as they are more

expensive than products not meeting these standards. This is because they do not really care about animal welfare (21) and because the television images one sees of how farm animals are sometimes kept are not in the buyer's mind when standing in the supermarket (3). Furthermore, consumers assume that all products in the supermarket meet at least certain standards ("otherwise, they wouldn't be sold") (3).

Consumers can be informed and educated about products and production methods in several ways:

1. Labelling of products produced in accordance with specific standards: studies on consumer concerns on animal welfare and their impact on food choice revealed that 77% of Irish consumers claimed to select animal friendly alternatives, with 70%, 64%, 53% and 38% making similar claims in Germany, France, Britain and Italy, respectively (22, 23). However, this data does not correspond with the actual size of the market for food products that meet certain animal welfare standards in Europe. This is probably because people tend to give answers with a socially desirable bias (21). It is also conceivable that consumers' claims may not always match their purchasing patterns for economic reasons, limited availability in mainstream shopping outlets, or lack of transparency (i.e. consumers are not able to distinguish between products). According to Harper et al. (22, 23), and in contrast with Spruijt (3) and Robben (21),

limited availability and the paucity of appropriate labelling were deemed greater barriers than cost. Labelling is often suggested as a means of informing the consumer about the way the product is produced, but it can also increase awareness and fulfil an educational role. The idea is that a transparent labelling system with several easily understood grades and widespread consumer recognition would allow consumers and retailers to distinguish between products and to purchase products of a known standard. Many products produced by the food industry are so-called credence goods, which means that consumers cannot discern their quality (including animal welfare aspects) prior to or after purchase (24). Since consumers are not able to distinguish by quality, they may choose the cheaper product that does not meet animal welfare standards. This may drive the more expensive product that is produced in accordance with animal welfare standards from the market (Gresham's law). Labelling, then, is the standard prescription for dealing with different quality, while allowing for consumer choice (25). Consumer confidence in the labelling system would, in turn, enhance marketing opportunities for high-quality and high-value products.

Labelling, however, is not a simple task, particularly where a substantial portion of trade is in processed products and traceability of compo-

nents is required. In the case of meat, over 65% of trade is in processed goods. Detailed labelling with traceability can be fairly costly. This cost is likely to be eventually passed on to consumers in the form of higher prices. Exporting countries could see it as a non-tariff trade barrier and importing countries could use it as a non-tariff trade barrier. An important issue is what standards labelling is expected to certify and how these standards will be established (9). Furthermore, for labelling to be successful, it is necessary to 'load' the label. If a label is 'loaded', it will acquire emotional significance. Only then it is possible to direct consumers' behaviour. This should be done from the consumer's point of view. "What additional value (e.g. better meat quality) will I get when buying this product?", and not from an ideological point of view (21).

The studies of Harper et al. (22, 23) revealed that consumers do not trust retailers, processors, producers or public institutions to provide the information on the label. Their trust in institutions providing information on matters such as animal welfare would be increased if they included representatives of consumer associations.

Mandatory labelling

The main advantage of mandatory labelling is that all products are labelled, thus providing the consumer with adequate information. Ideally, all

products, whether imported or not, receive a label that is clear, straightforward and easy to understand. Key words are: transparency, customer confidence, traceability and proper control (16).

Under the WTO TBT Agreement, members may apply technical regulations, such as labelling rules, to imports, provided that such regulations are non-discriminatory and that they do not restrict trade more than is necessary to fulfil a legitimate objective. Present WTO rules, however, do not specifically address animal welfare. Whether mandatory, neutral labelling is in accordance with WTO regulation, should become apparent from WTO case law. The EU has proposed agreeing an interpretative declaration in the WTO that indicates under which conditions obligatory labelling of agricultural products and processes is allowed, since appropriate mandatory labelling schemes for food and agricultural products may facilitate trade and improve market access, and thus increase the commercial value of products (26). Countries like the US, Australia and New Zealand are reluctant to include labelling in the negotiation process, but are at the same time working unilaterally on the introduction of obligatory labelling programmes. Taking into account the wide appeal for labelling, it would seem logical to arrange standards for labelling and its conditions within the WTO as

well (17).

Voluntary labelling

Voluntary labelling schemes are defined as standards under WTO TBT Agreement and do not conflict with existing multilateral rules. The main limitation of voluntary labelling is that only some of the products meeting specific standards have a label, leaving the consumer confused about the quality (including animal welfare aspects) of the products that are not labelled. Main key words are: transparency, adequate control by an independent body and consumer confidence. The information provided should be clear, straightforward and easy to understand (16). Mutual recognition of voluntary labelling schemes with non-EU countries is desirable (27).

Perspectives of labelling

Although labelling might help to inform consumers by providing them with adequate information, labelling is not a cure-all. In the studies of Harper et al. (22, 23), the paucity of appropriate labelling seemed to be a greater barrier than cost when buying products produced according to specific standards, but the outcome of these studies might be distorted by socially desirable bias.

The process of labelling products that do meet certain standards but are at the same time more

expensive, will only be successful if the label is 'loaded' and if consumers are seriously interested in the animal welfare aspects of products they are buying and, consequently, willing to pay more for products that are produced in accordance with animal welfare standards. Critics doubt whether consumers are willing to do so (3, 21). Furthermore, mandatory labelling seems to be difficult: according to the WTO, labelling should be non-discriminatory and not restrict trade more than is necessary to fulfil a legitimate objective. Another point of concern is how to include all information consumers are interested in (i.e. food safety, animal welfare, but also other non-trade concerns such as environmental aspects) in a single or a few labels, while still being transparent and clear. Besides, the information need may differ between countries and cultures. Internationally accepted levels require internationally accepted standards. As already shown in § 3.1.1, it will be difficult to develop such standards. Another point of concern is that labelling can be costly, particularly since traceability throughout the chain will be required. This will probably increase product cost and will eventually be passed on to consumers in higher prices (9). A likely alternative might be to provide meat products with a brand name. However, like a label, the brand name should be 'loaded' in order to give consumers a reason to buy an A brand product. If the brand name is not

properly loaded, consumers will still tend to compare products according to price (21).

In the case of mandatory labelling, the initiative should come from the Dutch government, the EU or from the chain organisations and NGOs and be finalised in legislation. In the case of voluntary labelling, the initiative should come from chain organisations and NGOs, perhaps supported by the Dutch government and the EU. Society in general may also put pressure on the various stakeholders to introduce labelling. It is the chain that is responsible when branding products.

2. Country/region of origin on the packaging: several representatives of chain organisations and NGOs would warmly welcome an obligatory indication of the country or region of origin on the packaging of pork and chicken meat. If this is the Netherlands or another EU state, it would imply that the product was produced in compliance with Dutch or EU legislation (28). At the moment, such an obligation only exists for beef. Recently, the EU commissioners Kyprianou (Consumers) and Fischer Boel (Agriculture) announced that they were planning to investigate the feasibility of this option (29). Introduction of an obligatory indication of the country or region of origin should be accompanied by a marketing/information campaign to build consumer awareness and explain the meaning of this kind of information ('loading of the label'). Whether an EU label is

more favourable than a country label should be investigated: consumers may identify more with the country they live in than with the EU (20). The Council believes that the Dutch government, the livestock industry, supermarkets and NGOs could and should play a role in providing information to the consumer and in building consumer awareness.

3. Information: information on products and production methods could be presented nationally or internationally to (specific groups within) the general public through television and other media. Supermarkets could also provide information on products and production methods, for example with through posters and leaflets. Special educational programs for schools groups within the general public could be developed. Examples of European initiatives are the 'Interactive Consumer Education Project' and the 'European Young Consumer Competition' (16). As well as the Dutch Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality and the EU, chain organisations could play a role in providing information. NGOs could also draw attention to this issue through initiating or supporting campaigns and providing information on this topic to their target groups.
Providing more information on products and production methods, may build greater consumer awareness. This could stimulate the demand for

animal friendly products. It would however take a long time before greater consumer awareness results in a change in attitude, affecting consumer purchasing patterns. Furthermore, despite the information, the problem of higher prices for products produced in accordance with animal welfare standards still remains. It is open to question whether consumers are willing to pay more for a product that does not have a distinct added value (30).

3.1.6. Investing in innovative research

In a world of increasing trade liberalisation and globalisation, the European market will be supplied not only with products produced on the home market but also with competing products coming from countries who produce more cheaply. If the Dutch and European agricultural sector wants to survive in the long term, this is not only likely to require greater specialisation, intensification and scaling up (31), but also investment in innovative research focussed on maintaining animal welfare while decreasing production costs (32). The initiative for investing in innovative research should come from the agricultural sector and may be supported by the Dutch government. Perhaps EU subsidies will also be available for this kind of research.

3.2. The plus option

In the plus option, animal welfare will be improved by more stringent legislation in the Netherlands and/or EU, or on the initiative of the chain. Additional efforts in the field of animal welfare are warmly welcomed by the Council, but will probably be on a voluntary basis and on the initiative of non-governmental stakeholders, given the current political climate in the Netherlands.

In addition to the options as described in § 3.1.1. - § 3.1.5, the Dutch government can raise animal welfare standards by promoting more stringent legislation. This can be done at a national or EU level. Raising standards on the initiative of the chain may offer an opportunity for the chain to anticipate more stringent legislation, to build up a lead in producing in accordance with more stringent standards and invest in new production methods at a favourable moment (33).

The consequence of more stringent legislation is that differences in animal welfare standards at global level will become greater. Farmers in the European Union, supported by the product boards and trade unions, contend that they should be compensated for any loss in competitiveness they might suffer as a result of more stringent legislation. The European Commission is proposing to change the structure of the Common Agricultural Policy payments. Subsidies

will then also be made conditional on compliance with EU sustainability issues, including animal welfare. Subsidising farmers for compliance with EU sustainability issues, however, is subject to serious criticism (18).

Besides the fear of putting the competitiveness of the domestic sector at risk, it is thought that more stringent legislation will result in the transfer of welfare problems abroad. This would result in the EU importing products that are not produced in accordance with EU animal welfare standards (16).

The Council would like to point out that producing in line with more stringent standards will not necessarily increase production or processing costs, especially if appropriate cost-containing technologies can be found (33). Furthermore, improved animal welfare is often synonymous with increased productivity, enhanced product quality and greater unit profitability (34, 35). Investment in innovative research will be necessary, not only to maintain animal welfare while decreasing production costs, but also to raise animal welfare without increasing production costs (32). The initiative for innovative research should be taken by the agricultural sector, but may be supported by the Dutch government and the EU.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Trade liberalisation and globalisation may have a limited, but positive effect on animal welfare in some

cases, e.g. export of live cattle to the Middle East may decrease due to the termination of export rebates (14) and the process of trade liberalisation and globalisation may open the possibility for a discussion on internationally accepted standards on farm animal welfare. However, many people feel that the positive consequences of trade liberalisation and globalisation are overshadowed by the expected negative consequences of trade liberalisation and globalisation for animal welfare. The most important negative consequence seems to be distortion of competition (14).

In dealing with a world of increasing liberalisation and globalisation, several strategies can be followed with regard to animal welfare:

1. Easing legislation in the area of animal welfare in the EU. Although from an economic point of view this might be an attractive strategy, from an animal welfare, societal and political point of view this option does not seem to be realistic and is not further explored in this report;
2. Business as usual: no easing or more stringent legislation on animal welfare in the Netherlands and/or the EU, no initiatives within the chain (i.e. livestock industry, processing industry, supermarkets and consumers) to improve farm animal welfare. This so-called "zero option" seems to be the most realistic option, given the political climate in the Netherlands and the different points of view within the EU concerning the

interest of animal welfare. Several initiatives could be taken here: in the WTO and EU framework and in the field of bilateral agreements, a voluntary code of practice, informing and educating consumers and investments in innovative research.

3. Improving animal welfare by more stringent legislation in the Netherlands and/or the EU or on the initiative of the chain. The additional efforts suggested in this option, the so-called "plus option", are warmly welcomed by the Council, but will probably be on a voluntary basis and on the initiative of non-governmental stakeholders (and under pressure of the public opinion and NGOs and supported by the Dutch government), given the current political climate in the Netherlands.

Within the zero option, a major step could be made if animal welfare is put on the WTO agenda. Ideally, the WTO would encourage and support the development of internationally acknowledged farm animal welfare standards. The application of other WTO related instruments, i.e. the admission of animal welfare in the green box, restricted demolition of tariffs, and/or a change of WTO regulations and their interpretation, however, should also be a point for attention. The Dutch Product Boards for Livestock, Meat and Eggs are not very optimistic about the feasibility of putting animal welfare on the WTO agenda, although the reluctance of many major non-

EU countries in putting non-trade concerns on the WTO agenda seems to have more to do with negotiation strategy. Nevertheless, even when animal welfare is placed on the WTO agenda, this strategy will only have results in the long term, and other strategies for dealing with the tense relationship between liberalisation/globalisation and animal welfare in the EU, and more specifically the Netherlands, should meanwhile also be pursued.

The Council remarks that it is of uttermost importance that the EU operates as one when putting animal welfare on the WTO agenda. Efforts to put animal welfare on the WTO agenda may fail if the different EU countries all speak for themselves and not with one single voice. Another option for getting animal welfare on the agenda is that the Netherlands forms a coalition with like-minded EU partners and third countries. In order to ease the path for WTO standards on animal welfare, the EU or the coalition could prepare animal welfare standards in advance, thereby facilitating the discussion.

The Council for Animal Affairs is of the opinion that all parties involved (i.e. Dutch government and/or EU, chain organisations, NGOs and Dutch and/or European society) have their own responsibility in dealing with animal welfare and could all contribute to this process in their own way by making use of the means at their disposal. The Council recommends the next tracks for dealing with farm animal welfare

in a world of increasing trade liberalisation and globalisation:

Short-term

Track 1: providing information to increase consumer awareness by all stakeholders involved (i.e. Dutch government, the chain, NGOs etc.) (preferably in combination with track 2 and/or 3).

Track 2: starting consultation about voluntary labelling of products of which the relation with animal welfare is obvious; branding might be an alternative; chain initiatives, for instance under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the Dutch government (preferably in combination with track 1).

Track 3: investigating the feasibility and if possible realising an obligatory indication of the country or region of origin on the packaging of meat within the Netherlands or the EU; initiative for a study on feasibility has already been announced by the EU (preferably in combination with track 1).

Track 4: starting consultation about a voluntary code of practice as a consequence of which supermarkets will only sell products produced in accordance with specific animal welfare standards (link to Eurep-GAP?)

and the processing industry will only use products produced in accordance with specific animal welfare standards; initiative by the supermarkets and/or processing industry, probably under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the Dutch government.

Track 5: bilateral negotiations on production in line with EU animal welfare standards with the most important exporting countries; Dutch government initiatives, under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the chain.

Track 6: enforcing changes in the structure of Common Agricultural Policy payments, thereby making subsidies conditional on compliance with EU sustainability issues, including animal welfare; Dutch government initiatives, pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the chain.

Track 7: placing animal welfare on the WTO agenda and starting with the development of standards on farm animal welfare within the WTO or IOE (in which case the IOE standards should have an obligatory character); Dutch government initiatives, under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the chain.

Track 8: investment in innovative research to maintain animal welfare while decreasing production costs; sector initiatives, probably supported by the Dutch government and/or the EU.

Medium-term

Track 1: realising branding or voluntary labelling of products of which the relation with animal welfare is obvious (continuation of track 2, short-term)

Track 2: realising a voluntary code of practice as a consequence of which supermarkets will only sell products that are produced in line with specific animal welfare standards (link to Eurep-GAP?) and the processing industry will only use products that are produced in line with animal welfare standards (continuation of track 4, short-term).

Track 3: realising a change in the structure of Common Agricultural Policy payments (continuation of track 6, short-term).

Track 4: development of standards (by the WTO or IOE) and a discussion within the WTO on WTO-regulations and their interpretation and financial instruments (continuation of track 7, short-term; scientist can play a ma-

ior role in developing standards on animal welfare in this phase).

Track 5: investment in innovative research to maintain animal welfare while decreasing production costs (continuation of track 8, short-term).

If not successfully completed in the short-term, tracks 1, 3 and 5 should be continued in the medium-term as well.

Long-term

Track 1: anchoring of farm animal welfare within the WTO; Dutch government initiatives, under pressure from public opinion, NGOs and the chain (continuation track 4, medium-term).

Track 2: working out and realisation of the plus option, which is a responsibility of all stakeholders.

REFERENCES

1. <http://encarta.msn.com>
2. Anonymous (2001). Scientists' assessment of the impact of housing and management on animal welfare. *J. Appl. Anim. Welfare Sci.*, 4(1), 3-52
3. Spruijt, B. Personal comments, 9-6-2004
4. Giffroy, J.M., and Beaufays, J.P. (2001). *Het Dierenwelzijn*. Publicatie van de Stichting Prins Laurent, nr. 1, Belgium
5. Brambell, F.W.R. (chairman) (1965). *Report of the Technical Committee to enquire into the welfare of animals kept under intensive husbandry systems*. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office
6. <http://www.cnn.com>
7. <http://news.bbc.co.uk>
8. <http://www.europa.eu.int>
9. Blandford, D., and Fulponi, L. (1999). Emerging public concerns in agriculture: domestic policies and international trade commitments. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 26 (3), 409-424
10. Bennett, R.M. (1996). People's willingness to pay for farm animal welfare. *Animal Welfare*, 5, 3-11
11. Miele, M., and Parisi, V. (2001). L'Etica del Mangiare, i valori e le preoccupazioni dei consumatori per il benessere animali negli allevamenti: un'applicazione dell'analisi Means-end Chain. *Rivista di Economia Agraria, Anno LVI, 1*, 81-103
12. Blokhuis, H.J., Jones, R.B., Geers, R., Miele, M., and Veissier, I. (2003). Measuring and monitoring animal welfare: transparency in the food product quality chain. *Animal Welfare*, 12, 445-455
13. Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (2004). *Facts and figures of the Dutch agri-sector 2004/2005*.
14. Haagsche Courant. *Akkoord over wereldhandel bedreigt dierenwelzijn*, 10-8-2004.
15. Jongerius, S.B.M. Personal comments, 10-12-2004 and 22-2-2005.
16. Wigboldus, L. (2004). *Room for Manoeuvre - options for animal welfare policy in the European Union*. Lelystad/Wageningen: ASG-WUR
17. Anonymous. Personal comments, 11-11-2003 en 23-12-2004
18. Fulponi, L. Personal comments, 31-3-2005
19. Financieel Dagblad, 5-9-2003

20. Blokhuis, H. Personal comments, 17-6-2004
21. Robben, H. Personal comments, 13-9-2004
22. Harper, G.C., and Henson, S.J. (2000). *Consumer values and farm animal welfare – the comparative report*. The University of Reading, U.K., EU FAIR CT98-3678
23. Harper, G.C., and Henson, S.J. (2001). *The level of consumer concern about animal welfare – the comparative report*. The University of Reading, U.K., EU FAIR CT98-3678
24. Caswell, J.A., and Mojduska, E.M. (1996). *Using informational labelling to influence the market for quality in food products*. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Agricultural Economics Association, San Antonio, Texas
25. Bureau, J.-C., Marette, S., and Schiavina, A. (1998). Non-tariff trade barriers and consumer's information: the case of EU-US trade dispute on beef. *European Review of Agricultural Economics*, 25 (4), 435-460
26. Committee on Agriculture (2001). Special session. *Mandatory labelling for agricultural products*. Note by the European Communities
27. Commission of the European Communities, 2002. *Communication from the commission to the council and the European Parliament on animal welfare legislation on farmed animals in third world countries and the implications for the EU*. Brussels, 18.11.2002 COM(2002) 626 final
28. Meeting of the Council of Animal Affairs, 22-2-2005
29. Agrarisch Dagblad. *Brussel: herkomst kipfilet moet wellicht op etiket*. 1-3-2005
30. Miele, M., and Vittoria, P. (2001). *Consumer concerns about animal welfare and the impact on food choice, strategies to address consumer concerns about animal welfare*. University of Pisa, Department of Agricultural Economics, Italy.
31. Massink, H., and Meester, G. (2002). *Boeren bij vrijhandel*. LNV-rapport
32. Klaver, J. Personal comments, 1-11-2004
33. Jeurissen, R. (2004). Institutional conditions of corporate citizenship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 53, 87-96
34. New Zealand Meat Research and Development Council (1997). *Meat quality, pH and animal stress*. New Zealand Meat Research and Development Council, Wellington
35. Jones, R.B. (2002). The role of comparative psychology in the development of effective environmental enrichment strategies to improve poultry welfare. *Intern. J. Comparative Psychol.*, 15, 77-106

APPENDICES

1. AGRICULTURAL TRADE BY THE NETHERLANDS AND EU

Table 1: agricultural trade by the EU

Agricultural products	EU export		EU import	
	EU export (x €thousand million)	Dutch share (%)	EU import (x €thousand million)	Dutch share (%)
Live animals	4.6	15.1	4.0	7.9
Meat and meat preparations	23.4	19.4	21.6	8.2
<i>of which:</i>				
Bovine meat	5.3	24.2	5.3	11.0
Pork	9.3	15.9	6.8	3.6
Poultry meat	3.9	29.2	3.4	9.7
Dairy products and eggs	21.2	18.7	18.1	11.3
<i>of which:</i>				
Dairy	19.0	18.4	16.2	11.5
Eggs	0.9	42.5	0.8	10.9

Source: Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (2004). *Facts and figures of the Dutch agri-sector 2004/2005*.

Table 2: agricultural trade by the Netherlands

Agricultural products	Dutch trade with EU countries		Dutch trade with third countries	
	Imports (x €million)	Exports (x €million)	Imports (x €million)	Exports (x €million)
Livestock	381	793	22	95
Meat	1805	4404	409	351
Eggs	204	475	12	47
Dairy	1913	3145	315	1023

Source: Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality (2004). *Facts and figures of the Dutch agri-sector 2004/2005*.

2. LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

The following people have contributed to this report:

- Dr. L. Fulponi, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
- R. Lapperre, The Netherlands Permanent Mission Geneva
- Prof. B. Spruijt, Department of Animals, Science and Society, Veterinary Faculty, Utrecht University
- Dr. H. Blokhuis, Animal Sciences Group, Wageningen-UR
- Prof. G. Crijns, Institute for Responsible Business, Nyenrode University
- Prof. H. Robben, Centre for Supply Chain Management, Nyenrode University
- Prof. R. Jeurissen, Nijenrode Centre for Sustainability, Nyenrode University
- J. Klaver, Product Boards for Livestock, Meat and Eggs
- S.B.M. Jongerius, Product Boards for Livestock, Meat and Eggs
- Y. Kleekamp, Dutch Society for the Protection of Animals
- M. de Jong-Timmerman, Dutch Society for the Protection of Animals
- J. Kossen, Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality
- H.W.A. Swinkels, Central Organisation for the Meat Industry

3. PUBLICATIONS

The Council for Animal Affairs has published the following reports since 2002. All reports are in Dutch. An overview of previous publications is available at the Council's office and at www.raadvoordierenaangelegenheden.nl.

PUBLICATIONS IN 2005:

- RDA 2005/01 De rol van wild bij de insleep en verspreiding van klassieke varkenspest en mond- en klauwzeer in Nederland
- RDA 2005/02 Immunosterilisatie als een alternatief voor de huidige wijze van castratie in de varkenshouderij

PUBLICATIONS IN 2004:

- RDA 2004/01 Dierziektebeleid met draagvlak – Advies over de bestrijding van zeer besmettelijke dierziekten; deel 2 – Onderbouwing van het advies
- RDA 2004/02 Herinrichting van het distributie- en kanalisatiesysteem van diergeneesmiddelen in Nederland
- RDA 2004/03 Negatief- en positieflijst voor vissen, reptielen en amfibieën ter invulling van artikel 33 van de Gezondheids- en welzijnswet voor dieren
- RDA 2004/04 Bestialiteit
- RDA 2004/05 Strategieën om te komen tot een efficiëntere opsporing van besmettelijke, aangifteplichtige dierziekten
- RDA 2004/06 Verkenning van de toekomstperspectieven voor agroproductieparken in Nederland

Jaarverslag 2003

PUBLICATIONS IN 2003:

- RDA 2003/01 Advies omtrent dierziekten en zoönosen, waarvoor hobbymatig gehouden dieren vatbaar zijn en als drager kunnen fungeren, die een bedreiging kunnen vormen voor de gezondheid van mensen en bedrijfsmatig gehouden dieren en die in het kader van grote bestrijdingscampagnes relevant zijn

- RDA 2003/02 Wet- en regelgeving omtrent hobbydieren
- RDA 2003/03 Mogelijke dierenwelzijnproblemen in de paardenhouderij
- RDA 2003/04 Zorgen voor je paard
- RDA 2003/05 Criteria voor dodingsmethoden voor paling en meerval
- RDA 2003/06 Het doden van drachtige grote landbouwhuisdieren
- RDA 2003/07 Negatief- en positieflijst voor zoogdieren en vogels ter invulling van artikel 33 van de Gezondheids- en welzijnswet voor dieren
- RDA 2003/08 Dierziektebeleid met draagvlak – Advies over de bestrijding van zeer besmettelijke dierziekten; deel 1 – Advies

Jaarverslag 2002

PUBLICATIONS IN 2002:

- RDA 2002/01 Minimum welzijnseisen tijdens bestrijdingscampagnes
- RDA 2002/02 Fokken met recreatiedieren (1)
- RDA 2002/03 Fokken met recreatiedieren (2)
- RDA 2002/04 Advies aan de Directeur Landbouw van het Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuurbeheer en Visserij inzake een plan van aanpak voor de bestrijding van aangeboren afwijkingen bij katten
- RDA 2002/05 Een toetsingskader en toelatingsprocedure voor aanwijzing van nieuwe voor productie te houden vissoorten