

## SPECIAL EDITION

In this special edition, we examine the UK Government's Action Plan for Animal Welfare

## FOIE GRAS

Jenny Canham considers whether the UK can finally achieve an import and sale ban

## WATOK

A-LAW's response to the post-implementation review of WATOK and our thoughts on areas for reform

## SCIENCE

Could hard-won gains for animals in science be at risk after absence from Action Plan?



### CONTENTS

The Animal Welfare (Sentience) Bill: A missed welfare opportunity	1
Shark Finning	3
2021: The year the UK finally bans foie gras?	5
An interview with Arthur Thomas, Public Affairs Manager at HSI/UK about trophy hunting	7
Save The Asian Elephants: A breakthrough?	10
Live exports and welfare in transport	12
Farrowing crates and enriched cages: Time for a complete phase-out	15
Response to the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (England) Regulations 2015 Post Implementation Review, January 2021	17
Fish Welfare	21
Puppy Imports	22
An analysis of the Kept Animals Bill: Importation	25
Dog theft on the rise: How in danger is your pet and what can be done about it?	28
Compulsory cat microchipping interview	30
Banning the private keeping of primates	32
Prohibiting glue traps	36
Animals used in experiments and risk of losing welfare gains	38
Animals in Science Working Group: Summary of Activity & Progress, June 2021	41

**Address:** A-law, c/o Clair Matthews, Monckton Chambers, 1&2 Raymond Buildings, Grays Inn, London, WC1R 5NR

**Email:** [info@alaw.org.uk](mailto:info@alaw.org.uk)

**Website:** [www.alaw.org.uk](http://www.alaw.org.uk)

**Trustees:** Paula Sparks, Alan Bates, Jeremy Chipperfield, Simon Cox, Jill Williams, Mike Radford, Abigail Scott, Natalie Harney, Blanche Koenig

**Editor:** Jill Williams

**Registered Office:** UK Centre for Animal Law, Emstrey House (North), Shrewsbury Business Park, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6LG. A company limited by guarantee (No 307802 - England).

**Registered Charity:** 1113462

The views expressed in this Journal are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of A-law.



## EDITOR'S NOTE

Animal welfare has been firmly on the agenda throughout 2020/21, hence this special summer edition of the Journal about DEFRA's [Action Plan for Animal Welfare](#). It reviews recent activity, outlines key topic areas including reports from A-LAW's Working Groups, and scopes a wide range of animal welfare related concerns.

At the time of publication, our membership will be aware of the situation in Afghanistan. There are two main charities operating in Kabul: Pen Farthing's Nowzad, and Charlotte Maxwell Jones Kabul Small Animal Rescue (KSAR).

KSAR is the less well-known charity, but like Nowzad is desperately seeking help to get animals and their team out of Afghanistan. KSAR is still taking in pet animals left behind by foreign nationals and contractors.

For more information and updates, visit:

[Kabul Small Animal Rescue \(@KSanimalRescue\) / Twitter](#)

[Kabul Small Animal Rescue, Afghanistan, need urgent help \(animalscharities.co.uk\)](#)

[War Paws | Facebook](#) (information about KSAR can also be found on War Paws Facebook)

[Nowzad | Facebook](#)

The A-Law Team wish both KSAR and Nowzad all our best hopes and wishes for the safety of the animals and teams. The animal welfare charities are not a threat to the new regime; they only seek to help animals, a simple act of compassion that accords with all religious traditions.

Jill Williams

Editor

Email: [journaleditor@alaw.org.uk](mailto:journaleditor@alaw.org.uk)

# Sentience & Enforcement

## The Animal Welfare (Sentience) Bill: A missed welfare opportunity

By Crustacean Compassion

*"Explicitly recognising and enshrining animals as sentient beings in law will be at the very heart of central government decision making going forward.... We have commissioned research into the sentience of decapod crustaceans and cephalopods, and, in light of the findings, we will consider further protections."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.8*

As an animal welfare organisation, we eagerly awaited the long-promised Animal Welfare (Sentience) Bill and welcomed its arrival. However, at the First Reading in the House of Lords, we were disappointed to find that the definition of 'animal' only extended to vertebrate animals (except humans) and did not include cephalopods molluscs and decapod crustaceans, like we and the Better Deal for Animals coalition called for in our joint proposed [Animal Welfare Strategy](#). Based on strong scientific evidence that decapods are sentient and can experience pain, we urgently call for their inclusion in the Sentience Bill during its passage to becoming law in this parliamentary session.

In 2005, the European Food Safety Authority categorised [decapods as sentient beings](#) and

since then [empirical evidence](#) has grown considerably, as has concerns for the welfare of these vulnerable animals and espousal for their legal protection - shown by robust support for [our campaign](#). Most recently, notable animal welfare organisations such as the [BVA](#) and [RSP-CA](#) have called for legal recognition of their sentience, as did the [Scottish Animal Welfare Commission](#) earlier this year.

Decapods suffer significantly in the food industry and are subjected to practices which would be considered unacceptable in vertebrate animals. They are frequently [crammed together in brightly lit tanks](#) or kept alive on ice, [a practice illegal in other countries](#). They are sold live to consumers for amateur home storage and killing, and are even posted [using couriers like Amazon](#), transported in the post or in a van amongst other packages. Decapods do receive minimal legal protections from injury and unnecessary suffering under the Welfare of Animals Transport (England) Order. However, this is rarely enforced and needs updating with appropriate codes of practice to ensure suitable transit conditions that do not lead to stress, injury or suffocation.

The most obvious cause of cruel treatment is inhumane slaughter methods, yet they are not adequately protected by the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing legislation. Decapods are routinely boiled alive (a situation in which an [edible crab may remain conscious for three minutes](#)), undergo freshwater drowning (a long and distressing process), and dismembered alive; yet there is no economic or culinary reason why decapods cannot be humanely dispatched through available [electrical stunning methods](#).

The Sentience Bill has provision for the addition of invertebrate animals and the Government's [Action Plan for Animal Welfare](#), published with the Bill, states that they will consider further protection based on the findings of commissioned research into the sentience of decapod



crustaceans and cephalopods. This [commissioned research](#) was conducted of the back off our campaign in 2018. It was commissioned and completed by LSE Enterprise in 2020 but the results have still not been published.

We believe the welfare issues faced by these animals are so severe that it would be inappropriate to delay their inclusion, particularly since there is ample evidence of their sentience. We need Defra to promptly release the LSE report so that its findings can underpin inclusion of these animals in the Sentience Bill, and other animal welfare legislation.

This is a pivotal time for animal welfare legislation and if the UK truly wants to establish itself as an authoritative global leader in animal welfare, it must be led by scientific evidence, not by presumption or political convenience.

### **About Crustacean Compassion**

At Crustacean Compassion we campaign for the humane treatment of decapod crustaceans

and lobby for their inclusion in the definition of 'animal' in *all* relevant animal welfare legislation, including the diverse Animal Welfare Acts of the UK, the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing legislation, and the Animals in Scientific Procedures Act and of course the Animal Welfare (Sentience) Bill. The Sentience Bill is a key opportunity get these vulnerable animals legally recognised as sentient beings.

# Trade & International Advocacy

## Shark Finning

By **Laura Jackson (private practice solicitor) & Eleanor Sibley (Field Court Chambers)**

*"Shark finning is the practice of removing a shark's fins at sea and discarding the finless body back in the water. It is a barbaric practice that has rightly been banned in the UK for nearly 20 years, but we do still import shark fins which may contribute to the practice. To this end, we will bring in legislation to ban the import and export of detached shark fins."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.9*

There are believed to be over 400 species of sharks in the oceans. They have outlived the dinosaurs and many other species on earth, but in the present day, 70-150 million sharks are killed each year and some populations have decreased by more than 90%. One third of all shark species are considered to be either vulnerable, endangered or critically endangered as listed by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature. Sharks are not only precious in themselves, but being apex predators, they are essential to conservation of the marine ecosystem and in striking an equilibrium for all life in and out of the sea.

There are a number of substantial threats to sharks including diving programmes, unregulated shark fishing, shark bycatch from fishing, ghost nets, shark nets along beaches, pollution,

marine debris, and most notably, shark finning. This barbaric practice has been sustained by demands for shark fin soup, souvenirs and jewellery. The act of 'shark finning' refers to the act of slicing the fins from a shark, often while it is still alive. Because the fins are more lucrative and the bodies take up space, sharks are often then thrown back overboard from the fishing boat, discarded into the water again, where they sink to the bottom and either drown or bleed to death.

Since 2003, EU Regulations, which have been implemented into UK law, have restricted shark finning. However, significant loopholes have allowed the import of shark fin products and (until 2013) shark finning itself to continue.

For example, EU Regulation 1185/2003, which banned the practice of shark finning within the EU, contained an exemption, permitting member states to issue special fishing permits that allowed shark fins to be removed at sea, provided that the ratio of fins to carcasses on landing did not exceed 5%.

In 2013, the EU passed Regulation 605/2013, which removed this exemption. However, it continued to allow the import of shark fin products. Regulation 206/2009 permits individuals to bring 20kg of dried shark fin into the EU for home consumption, without being subject to border controls. One 20kg portion could equate to hundreds of sharks being killed, depending on their size<sup>1</sup>, and the exemption makes it difficult to detect and prevent illegal trade in CITES-protected species.

In December 2020, the UK government launched a call for evidence on the shark fin trade. Its Action Plan for Animal Welfare, launched on 12 May 2021, announced that it proposes to ban the im-

<sup>1</sup> <https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-06-07/debates/081C04E8-CAAA-408D-8AD1-85A058640393/AnimalWelfare>



port and export of shark fins obtained as a result of “shark finning”.

This is very welcome news. However, the devil will be in the detail. To be effective, the ban needs to extend beyond whole shark fins to shark fin products. The government resisted calls to confirm whether this will be the case<sup>2</sup>.

**Postscript: On 15th August 2021, the UK Government announced<sup>3</sup> it would introduce legislation to ban the import and export of detached shark fins, as well as the import and export of products also containing shark fins.**

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.theyworkforyou.com/debates/?id=2021-06-17c.439.1>

<sup>3</sup> [https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-to-introduce-world-leading-ban-on-shark-fin-trade?utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=g-ovuk-notifications&utm\\_source=617da2ed-0c00-423b-9337-ab-287c6f5b4f&utm\\_content=immediately](https://www.gov.uk/government/news/government-to-introduce-world-leading-ban-on-shark-fin-trade?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=g-ovuk-notifications&utm_source=617da2ed-0c00-423b-9337-ab-287c6f5b4f&utm_content=immediately)

# 2021: The year the UK finally bans foie gras?

By Jenny Canham, Campaigns and Public Affairs Specialist, Animal Equality UK

*"The production of foie gras by force feeding is already illegal in the UK. Now the [Brexit] transition period has finished, we are committed to building a clear evidence base to inform decisions on banning the import or sale of foie gras and other products derived from low-welfare systems."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.10*

Animal Equality has tirelessly campaigned to ban the import and sale of foie gras in the UK for years, along with other animal protection organisations. In March 2021, Defra announced plans to implement a ban on foie gras 'in the next few months'. While delighted by the news, we want actions, not words. In response, Animal Equality coordinated an open letter signed by cross-party MPs, urging George Eustice MP and Lord Zac Goldsmith to share a concrete roadmap, publicly outlining when and how the ban will be written into law<sup>1</sup>. This garnered high profile media coverage, including in The Observer and The Guardian, and even prompted a response from France's foie gras producer's association<sup>2</sup>.

Defra has since launched its Action Plan for Animal Welfare - in which it notes that it is 'exploring a ban on the sale of foie gras'<sup>3</sup>. Animal Equality again celebrates this positive progress, while remaining determined to hold Defra to its word.

1 <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/mar/28/mps-unite-to-call-for-total-ban-on-wicked-foie-gras-in-the-uk>

2 <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/apr/17/we-love-foie-gras-french-outrage-uk-plan-import-ban-delicacy>

3 <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-to-lead-the-way-on-animal-welfare-through-flagship-new-action-plan>

We continue to meet monthly with Government officials personally to discuss this important issue, in order to ensure that the UK finally ends its support of the cruel and torturous practice of force-feeding.

The production of foie gras in the UK is illegal, on animal cruelty grounds, but we still import around 200 tonnes of the product each year.<sup>4</sup> The product is then sold by a select number of high-end retailers and delis throughout Great Britain. After years of campaigning, we remain cautiously optimistic, and are aware that more must still be done to ensure that this ban is implemented as soon as possible. Until then, ducks and geese will continue to endure agonising treatment while the UK market supports production of this vile 'delicacy'.

The UK public strongly backs the call to ban foie gras in the UK; Animal Equality is currently celebrating surpassing the milestone of 200,000 signatures on the relevant petition.<sup>5</sup> It's clear that the public wants foie gras banned. Celebrities are also keen to show their support for the campaign, with endorsements from Thandiwe Newton, Ricky Gervais, and Alan Carr. Peter Egan even joined Animal Equality to witness the cruelty that takes place on foie gras farms first-hand.<sup>6</sup>

The public's desire to see a ban enacted soon is understandable given the cruelty involved in the production of foie gras. The force-feeding process (known as gavage) involves forcing a tube down the throats of ducks and geese, to funnel inside of them larger amounts of food than they would ever willingly ingest. An abundance of scientific evidence, including a study conducted by the University of Cambridge in 2015,<sup>7</sup> shows that foie gras production by force-feeding generates severe physical and psychological pain for the animals involved, and not only when the tube is down their throats. The production pro-

4 <https://www.franceagrimer.fr/fam/content/download/34895/document/STA-VBL-FOIE%20GRAS-2014-11-18.pdf?version=3>

5 <https://animalequality.org.uk/act/ban-force-feeding>

6 <https://animalequality.org.uk/news/breaking-harrowing-scenes-of-ducks-and-geese-being-ruthlessly-force-fed-filmed-on-a-farm-in-france/>

7 <https://bit.ly/3sybw7l> Professor D.M. Broom – Dr. I. Rochlitz – "The Welfare of Ducks in Foie Gras Production"

cess causes their livers to swell up to 10 times their natural size, before the animal's diseased liver is sold and marketed as foie gras.

The process of gavage is considered incompatible with the provisions of the Animal Welfare Act (2006), as well as The Welfare of Farmed Animals Regulations (across England, Northern Ireland, Scotland, and Wales). Domestic legislation states that: 'Animals shall be fed a wholesome diet which is appropriate to their age and species and which is fed to them in sufficient quantity to maintain them in good health, to satisfy their nutritional needs and to promote a positive state of well-being.' And: 'No animals shall be provided with food or liquid in a manner, nor shall such food or liquid contain any substance, which may cause them unnecessary suffering or injury.'

Countless UK companies have already turned their backs on foie gras. In February, Fortnum and Mason made the decision to stop selling it, following years of protests from fellow animal protection organisations.<sup>8</sup> In response, Lord Zac Goldsmith (Minister of State and Animal Welfare Minister) tweeted, 'Foie gras is unbearably barbaric. It's hard to imagine anyone could watch the process and still enjoy eating it.' Also, thanks to Animal Equality's investigations showing the harsh realities behind foie gras production, the Tate Modern museum dropped foie gras from its menu too.<sup>9</sup>

Many MPs have also been keen to speak out on this topic, with Sir Mike Penning MP currently leading an Early Day Motion. Also, with the help of Henry Smith MP, Animal Equality previously hosted a reception in the House of Commons, prompting an adjournment debate in Parliament on the proposed ban. Dr Lisa Cameron MP, another avid supporter of Animal Equality's campaign, said, "This is very welcome news and I am pleased to see that action is being taken. Foie gras is an immensely cruel product which causes a huge amount of animal suffering. We cannot rightly think of ourselves as a nation of animal lovers whilst still

selling foie gras, which is why I am joining Animal Equality's call to implement a ban on foie gras imports and sales as soon as possible!"

Foie gras has no place in our society. While we are optimistic about this historic legislation finally coming into place, it is critical that the Government responds to demands from both the public and politicians by committing to a ban publicly, identifying when this will be introduced into Parliament. Every day this is delayed is another day that the UK is supporting a practice it deems too cruel to be carried out on its shores. 2021 must see the end of foie gras made by force-feeding in the UK.

To join the campaign, as the UK moves closer to a ban on foie gras imports and sales, sign Animal Equality's petition calling for this landmark win for animals to finally be confirmed: [www.animalequality.org.uk/act/ban-force-feeding](http://www.animalequality.org.uk/act/ban-force-feeding).

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-g248741/Fortnum-Mason-axes-sale-torture-tin-foie-gras-decades-pressure.html>

<sup>9</sup> <https://animalequality.org.uk/news/victory-tate-modern-drops-cruel-foie-gras-from-its-menu/>



# An interview with Arthur Thomas, Public Affairs Manager at HSI/UK about trophy hunting

By Britha Parekh, Lawyer

*"We will deliver on our 2019 Manifesto Commitment to ban the import of hunting trophies from endangered animals abroad, by bringing forward legislation to ensure UK imports and exports of hunting trophies are not threatening the conservation status of species abroad."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.11*

## 1. What is trophy hunting and what are the types of trophy hunting?

Trophy hunting is the killing of an animal to obtain animal parts (such as their heads, hides, claws, teeth, tusks, horns, skin, or the whole stuffed animal) for display but not for subsistence. Trophy hunters compete with one another in contests sponsored by trophy hunting industry organisations to kill animals with the largest trophies (for example biggest tusks or horns) or the most animals of a certain type (for example, "Bears of the World Grand Slam").

## 2. Which countries are the biggest importers and exporters of trophy animals?

The biggest exporters of hunting trophies currently are Canada and South Africa according to the trade data of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) between 2014 and 2018. Every year hunters from around the world travel to Canada to hunt and kill black and brown bears, wolves, mountain lions, lynx and even polar bears and other species. In South

Africa, African elephants, lions, leopards, rhinos, giraffes are all killed for fun by trophy hunters, despite dwindling numbers of the species in recent years. The United States is the world's largest importer of hunting trophies. One estimate puts the U.S. trophy imports accounted for 71% of this global trade.

However, trophy hunting is not limited to Africa and North America. Our HSI Europe team have just released a report looking at trophy hunting across Europe and the numbers are shocking. Trophy hunters from across the continent import thousands of trophies a year, but also some European countries allow trophy hunting of wolves, bears, lynx and other majestic species. This is a global problem, a relic from the Victorian age which needs to end.

## 3. Apart from being cruel, why is trophy hunting so bad ecologically?

Trophy hunting is bad not only for the welfare of the animals but for the conservation of populations, the survival of species and the biodiversity of habitats.

From a welfare perspective, trophy hunters delight in the "sport" of killing and not the welfare of the animal. Hunters use weapons that can cause prolonged suffering. The classic example of this is Cecil the Lion who was shot with an arrow and suffered from injuries for around 10 hours before finally being killed by the hunter. Hunters are also often inexperienced and will wound and animal and take many shots to kill it, leading to enormous suffering.

From a conservation point of view, trophy hunting is a disaster. Trophy hunting is legal in a number of countries in Africa and elsewhere and many endangered species are targeted. While the hunting industry likes to claim that it provides funding for anti-poaching efforts and protects species, this is not backed up by the science or conservation ethics. So called conservation fees are paid by hunters but the money raised is woefully insufficient to conserve declining species and rarely make it to where it is needed most. In the meantime, population numbers have continued to decline due to myriad of anthropogenic and biodiversity threats since the practice of trophy hunting came to prominence. We need



to invest in genuine non-consumptive measures that protect these species and benefit the communities that live alongside them. Sadly, that will never be achieved by the hunting industry whose primary motive will always be greed and killing animals.

#### **4. What is the Humane Society doing to stop trophy hunting?**

Humane Society is working in a number of countries to oppose trophy hunting. In the UK we are working to support the government's efforts and hold them to account to their commitment to introduce the world's toughest import/export ban. Many of our other offices are supporting similar efforts in their countries. However, this work extends beyond trophy import bans to increasing protections of specific species, promoting co-existence between wildlife and humans, supporting non-consumptive conservation efforts and much more.

Lord Goldsmith was right when he said we need a new covenant with nature, we are living

through an extinction age and without a radical recalibration of our relationship with the natural world many of the species that we learn about at school will be lost for ever. HSI offices around the world are working to end the most harmful practices inflicted on the animals and the natural world and help write that new covenant.

#### **5. What is the UK position in the light of the Animal Welfare Action plan? Are the plans in danger of being watered down?**

The language used in the Animal Welfare Action Plan was concerning. Under the current system UK hunters who kill endangered species can do so and bring back their trophies once approved by the government. This system is fundamentally flawed, relying as it does on a complex paper trail and on importing countries often just trusting the declarations of hunters and exporting countries, without carrying out due diligence. For example, exporting countries are required under CITES to present non-detrimental findings (NDFs), which are designed to ensure that trophy hunting of animals do not have a detri-

mental effect on the survival of the species. In reality, NDFs are rarely rooted in rigorous science and lack strict oversight. Numerous studies have shown quotas set at unsustainably high levels, widespread corruption and a well-funded industry trained in finding loopholes and exploiting them. That is why banning only trophies of endangered species or giving “conservation exemptions” to certain trophies, as the government has indicated, was so troubling, it appears to mirror the current system and would amount to business as usual.

## **6. What strategies could be used to put pressure on the Safari Club International and other such outfits?**

HSI has worked to expose trophy hunting industry groups like Safari Club International by drawing attention to their promotion of killing at-risk species for fun and weakening wildlife protection measures. However, applying pressure to the industry will not end trophy hunting, which is why our main focus though is on working with governments to bring in laws to end the practice of trophy hunting, including through import bans that ensure that hunters can't bring their macabre souvenirs home with them.

## **7. Given that this is an international trade, how could a ban on trophy hunting be enforced?**

In the UK we are working towards a ban on the import and export of hunting trophies. This would effectively end UK involvement in the trophy hunting industry. Similar bans have been implemented in Australia and France on the import of lion trophies. The UK public overwhelmingly oppose trophy hunting with recent polling showing that 85% want a strong ban brought in as soon as possible. The UK ban would not end trophy hunting globally but end UK involvement in the practice and would send a powerful message internationally that killing for kicks is not acceptable, especially in a world facing an extinction crisis.

# Save The Asian Elephants: A breakthrough?

By Duncan McNair, Lawyer and Founder & CEO of Save The Asian Elephants (STAE)

*"We will deliver on our 2019 Manifesto Commitment to ban the import of hunting trophies from endangered animals abroad, by bringing forward legislation to ensure UK imports and exports of hunting trophies are not threatening the conservation status of species abroad."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.11*

**"Don't bother - elephants are finished."  
"You must be joking. Anyway it's India's problem."  
"It's big money talking, and you'll never change that."  
"Surely the travel industry will sort it out if you ask them?"**

These were some early putdowns I received on returning, appalled, from my first trip to India, in 2014, to investigate the horrors to Asian elephants in modern tourism of which I had been hearing.

They had some truth: the species is indeed in desperate peril. Yes too, vested interests like the UK travel industry could do so much, as could India and the other range states. But what to do? After all the UK cannot compel a mighty sovereign State like India to adopt our ideals of elephant welfare - particularly when our own cupboards rattle with skeletons such as brutal industrialised farming or a shameful legacy of trophy hunting.

I had noted that India has excellent animal welfare laws, according elephants the highest degree of protection. But these are widely circum-

vented by political interference and protection of vested interests.

Surely though the world's most revered species, the Asian elephant, should not end its long journey on Earth under the cruellest of all animal abuse, babies screaming and crying under extreme torture to break their spirits ("pajan") for easy use in tourism?

In 2015 I founded STAE, from the shared conviction amongst a growing team that in a functioning democracy a proper cause relentlessly advanced, linked to coherent, credible objectives, should prevail over time. STAE's policies were premised on driving up public awareness; but not contingent on the concurrence of vested interests profiting from the abuse, nor of governments of indigenous states over which external influence can only be limited.

I believed new UK law must be a first objective - a ban on the UK's enormous industry in adverts and sale of access to brutal elephant "attractions", so damaging to this endangered species in snatching baby and young elephants from the wild into ruthless torture and non-breeding captivity whose visceral horrors I had witnessed.

STAE engaged at once with travel industry's representative bodies. Thorough research has revealed the complete failure of the industry's self-regulation and its endless broken promises of change. Compulsion of law seems essential to stem supply, and demand, of this vast, unregulated, pernicious trade in abuse. To date STAE has identified over 1,200 tour companies promoting 250 venues to the UK market where extreme brutality is committed to baby and adult elephants. These places are also lethal for humans. Abused elephants regularly attack and kill. Moreover tens of thousands of cramped, fetid locations are a breeding ground for airborne viruses like TB and, science now indicates, Covid-19 which broken down elephants readily transmit to humans through exhaling, coughing, sneezing, spraying water. Mention of such deadly dangers is rare in tour operators' published output.

I have aimed to speak in person to every constituency of opinion - Parliaments, universities, vet schools, temples, churches, professions, busi-



ness, the public at large. The travel industry's mantle of secrecy, long concealing the horrors, lifted and with it public outrage. By Spring 2021 90% of Britons polled, 32m petition signatories and 100 key influencers backed STAE's policies for change. Government up to the highest levels has been helpful and receptive in our many meetings. They requested STAE provide a draft Bill. Hopes of change ran high.

In May 2021 came a breakthrough: Government's announcement of an Animals Abroad Bill to ban advertising and sales of "low-welfare" elephant (and other wildlife) tourist attractions.

We must not count chickens. The industry profiting from the abuse turns over many billions. We expect stiff resistance from its lobbyists, already at work. Important issues of structure of the Bill, of key definitions, sanctions and enforcement, lie ahead. If it holds, STAE considers such law apt for countries across the globe, steering the market towards genuine, ethical sanctuaries where elephants are observed from a respectful distance as they exhibit natural behaviour in

herds. Whilst Asian elephants suffer uniquely from abusive tourism, this change must herald the protection of many other species too.

Who knows the destiny of this ancient species, inhabitants of Earth long before Man? What Man has done so wrong, he can put right. Law must be instrumental in this. Asian elephants, "megagardeners of the forests" on which we all rely, deserve no less. We should see all species and their habitat as integral to Earth and its balance, their value not in their utility to Man but intrinsic, policy making involving animals and their terrain affording protection and respect. I hope there is time for the elephants, and better days for all the species.

**Photo credit: Lek Chailert / Save the Asian Elephants**

# Farmed Animals

## Live exports and welfare in transport

By Natalie Harney, Co-chair Farmed Animal Law Working Group, UK Centre for Animal Law

*“Taking advantage of our status as an independent trading nation, we will legislate to end the export of live animals for fattening and slaughter. Our departure from the EU has provided us with a much-awaited opportunity to address this long-standing ambition.*”

*“The government has consulted on a number of other welfare in transport reforms, such as setting maximum journey times, space allowances for animals and temperature controls. We 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.”*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.12*

### Summary of proposals

DEFRA's Action Plan for Animal Welfare includes a commitment to legislate to end live exports for slaughter and fattening.<sup>1</sup> On 8 June 2021, shortly after the publication of the Action Plan, the An-

imal Welfare (Kept Animals) Bill<sup>2</sup> ('the Bill') was introduced in Parliament, with clause 42 containing a proposed prohibition on live exports for slaughter and fattening. At the time of writing, the Bill is making progress through the House of Commons.

The Bill, as introduced, would make it a criminal offence<sup>3</sup> to export so-called 'relevant livestock' from Great Britain for slaughter.<sup>4</sup> 'Slaughter' includes fattening for the eventual purpose of slaughter.<sup>5</sup> During a recent public consultation, DEFRA proposed limiting export journeys for fattening to those where animals would be slaughtered within six months of arrival at their destination.<sup>6</sup> However, this time limit appears to have been abandoned in the Bill. 'Relevant livestock' is defined as:

- (a) bulls, cows, heifers, calves, buffalo or bison,
- (b) horses, ponies, donkeys, asses, hinnies, mules or zebras,
- (c) sheep,
- (d) goats, or
- (e) pigs or wild boar<sup>7</sup>

Clause 43 would empower each national authority in Great Britain to pass its own regulations providing for the enforcement of the proposed prohibition in clause 42. This may include the imposition of civil sanctions<sup>8</sup> and the revocation of licences, authorisations or approvals.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Animal Welfare (Kept Animals) HC Bill (2021-22) [13] (Kept Animals Bill).

<sup>3</sup> Kept Animals Bill, cl 42(2).

<sup>4</sup> Kept Animals Bill, cl 42(1).

<sup>5</sup> Kept Animals Bill, cl 42(4)(b).

<sup>6</sup> DEFRA, 'Consultation on improvements to animal welfare in transport' (December 2020) para 6.

<sup>7</sup> Kept Animals Bill, cl 42(7).

<sup>8</sup> Kept Animals Bill, cl 43(3)(f).

<sup>9</sup> Kept Animals Bill, cl 43(3)(g).

<sup>1</sup> DEFRA, Our Action Plan for Animal Welfare (May 2021) 12.



## Analysis

The effect of clause 42 as it is currently drafted would be to prohibit live exports for slaughter and fattening of most traditionally farmed terrestrial mammalian species. Poultry and rabbits are not included within the definition of 'relevant livestock'. There is also no limit on live exports of any species for breeding purposes. These exclusions are not unexpected<sup>10</sup> but do give cause for concern.

According to SRUC, '[t]ransport is regarded as a major source of stress and reduced welfare in all species at all ages including poultry',<sup>11</sup> and research has shown that poultry mortality increases markedly during journeys that exceed four hours.<sup>12</sup> Although research about the impact of transport on rabbits is more limited,

known hazards to rabbit welfare in transport include inadequate space allowances, unsuitable floor type, unfamiliar mixing, thermal stress and poor ventilation.<sup>13</sup> A 2018 Italian study found that rabbit dead on arrival rates increased by up to 40% after journeys lasting longer than three hours compared with journeys shorter than one hour.<sup>14</sup> In view of scientific evidence such as this, the decision not to include poultry and rabbits within the definition of 'relevant livestock' is disappointing. The UK exports more poultry than any other terrestrial farmed species<sup>15</sup> and so this omission affects significant numbers of animals. Turning to breeding exports, it is typically claimed that breeding animals are transported in better conditions.<sup>16</sup> This may be the case for

<sup>10</sup> DEFRA, 'Consultation on improvements to animal welfare in transport' (December 2020) paras 26-27.

<sup>11</sup> M. A Mitchell, J. Martin and P.J. Kettlewell, 'A review of the evidence on welfare aspects of the transport of live animals' (September 14 2018) 231.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid* para 70.

<sup>13</sup> EFSA, 'Scientific Opinion Concerning the Welfare of Animals during Transport' (2011) EFSA Journal 9(1), para 2.6.2.1.

<sup>14</sup> Claudia Caucci et al, 'Risk factors for pre-slaughter mortality in fattening and breeding rabbits' (2018) *Livestock Science* 210

<sup>15</sup> Farm Animal Welfare Committee, 'Opinion on the welfare of animals during transport' (April 2019) Table 1;

<sup>16</sup> DEFRA, 'Consultation on improvements to animal welfare in transport' (December 2020) para 26.

some higher value animals. However, with the exception of increased space allowances for some pregnant ruminant species,<sup>17</sup> the minimum legal standards that apply during transport are the same irrespective of whether an animal is being exported for slaughter, fattening or breeding. Any decision to transport breeding animals in better conditions is therefore largely at the discretion of the transporter.

The decision to prohibit exports of some species in some circumstances but not others is an example of confused policy-making. It is illogical to suggest that exports for breeding purposes are better in the absence of more stringent minimum legal standards for breeding animals. Similarly, it is ethically inconsistent to allow live exports of poultry and rabbits to continue in light of scientific evidence about the impact of transport on their welfare, which is no less compelling than that available about other species.

DEFRA's objective appears to be to allay public concern<sup>18</sup> about discrete aspects of the live export trade. This is unsurprising, as discussion about breeding animals, poultry and other less visible species, such as rabbits, has been largely absent from the public debate about live exports. It does, however, seem that an opportunity to place more meaningful limits on live exports that would benefit equally affected species and animals may have been missed. A general prohibition on live exports for slaughter, fattening and breeding, subject to an exception regime underpinned by higher welfare standards, would offer a more preferable and ethically consistent solution.

DEFRA has indicated in its **Action Plan** that it is considering other reforms to welfare in transport, which may include future legislative changes.<sup>19</sup> It would be better to address live exports and welfare in transport in a single dedicated welfare in transport Bill. Nevertheless, any future legislative proposals relating to welfare in transport must include species-specific and lifestage-specific measures to improve general

transport conditions, particularly for any species or type of animal that may still be subject to export journeys.

## Conclusion

There is much to celebrate about the prospect of an end to live exports of some species for slaughter and fattening. However, it is important to remember that the proposed prohibition as it is currently drafted would allow significant parts of the live export trade to continue. This is unsatisfactory and better approaches are available. Furthermore, language choices matter and the decision to use unfortunate wording, such as 'relevant livestock', sends a troubling message. This choice of phrase should be abandoned and ideally any prohibition should be extended to include poultry and rabbits, as the welfare of these farmed species during transport matters, too. Additional legislative measures to improve welfare in transport more generally should also be introduced as a matter of priority.

**Postscript: On 18th August 2021, DEFRA announced<sup>20</sup> measures to improve domestic welfare in transport, including around maximum journey times, headroom requirements, and maximum and minimum acceptable temperature ranges.**

<sup>17</sup> Council Regulation (EC) 1/2005 of 22 December 2004 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations [2005] OJ L3/1, Annex I, Chapter VIII (retained EU law at the time of writing).

<sup>18</sup> DEFRA, 'Consultation on improvements to animal welfare in transport' (December 2020) para 21.

<sup>19</sup> DEFRA, *Our Action Plan for Animal Welfare* (May 2021) 12.

<sup>20</sup> DEFRA, 'Better welfare conditions for millions of farm animals during transit' (18 August 2021) < <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/better-welfare-conditions-for-millions-of-farm-animals-during-transit> > accessed 22 August 2021.



# Farrowing crates and enriched cages: Time for a complete phase-out

By **Danielle Duffield, Solicitor & Co-chair Farmed Animal Law Working Group, UK Centre for Animal Law**

*"We have a strong track record for raising the bar when it comes to farm animal welfare standards, such as banning battery cages for laying hens, sow stalls for pigs and veal crates for calves. We want to continue to build on this and we are currently considering the case for introducing further reforms, on areas such as the use of farrowing crates for pigs and cages for laying hens."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.12*

In its Action Plan for Animal Welfare published in May 2021, the UK government has stated that it will be examining the use of farrowing crates for pigs and enriched cages for layer hens.<sup>1</sup> This commitment does not go far enough: it is time to end the use of these outdated confinement systems which significantly compromise the welfare of millions of animals.

Farrowing crates are a cage in which a mother sow is confined before, during and after giving birth (farrowing). In the crate, a sow's movement is significantly restricted and she is unable to turn around.<sup>2</sup> The crates also prevent a sow

from building a nest prior to giving birth, thereby depriving her of a highly motivated behaviour.<sup>3</sup> Although the Code of Practice for Pigs provides that a sow should only be confined in a crate for the minimum time possible following farrowing,<sup>4</sup> she will generally be caged from before the birth of her piglets, until her piglets are weaned at approximately four weeks old.<sup>5</sup> Approximately 58% of UK sows are kept in farrowing crates around the time of giving birth.<sup>6</sup>

Enriched cages for layer hens present similar welfare concerns. Although battery cages for egg-laying hens were banned in 2012, "enriched" or "colony" are still permitted.<sup>7</sup> Although these cages provide hens with a small amount of extra space per bird and include enrichments for nesting, scratching and perching, a hen's ability to express normal behaviours is still severely restricted.<sup>8</sup> Ultimately, the principal objection to the battery cage – that it forces birds to live in unnatural conditions, away from their outdoor habitat and unable to move freely or interact with one another – also applies to the enriched cage.

The ongoing use of farrowing crates and enriched cages on UK farms present not just a welfare problem, but a legal one. It is fundamentally difficult to reconcile the highly restrictive nature of these cages with the requirement of the Animal Welfare Acts that the "needs" of an animal be provided for, including an animal's "need to be able to exhibit normal behaviour patterns."<sup>9</sup> Similarly, the requirement of the welfare regulations

1 See UK Government "Action Plan for Animal Welfare" (May 2021) at pages 6 and 12, available at [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/985332/Action\\_Plan\\_for\\_Animal\\_Welfare.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/985332/Action_Plan_for_Animal_Welfare.pdf).

2 See Compassion in World Farming "Pig Welfare", available at <https://www.ciwf.org.uk/farm-animals/pigs/pig-welfare/> and RSPCA Assured "What are Farrowing Crates?", available at <https://www.rspcaassured.org.uk/farm-animal-welfare/pigs/what-are-farrowing-crates/>.

3 Compassion in World Farming "Pig Welfare", available at <https://www.ciwf.org.uk/farm-animals/pigs/pig-welfare/>.

4 Code of Practice for the Welfare of Pigs (England), at para 158.

5 See RSPCA Assured "What are Farrowing Crates?", available at <https://www.rspcaassured.org.uk/farm-animal-welfare/pigs/what-are-farrowing-crates/>.

6 RSPCA Assured "What are Farrowing Crates?", available at <https://www.rspcaassured.org.uk/farm-animal-welfare/pigs/what-are-farrowing-crates/>.

7 See the Welfare of Farmed Animals (England) Regulations 2007, Schedule 4; the Welfare of Farmed Animals (Scotland) Regulations 2010, Schedule 3; the Welfare of Farmed Animals (Wales) Regulations, Schedule 4; the Welfare of Farmed Animals Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2012.

8 See Compassion in World Farming "Egg Laying Hens", <https://www.ciwf.org.uk/farm-animals/chickens/egg-laying-hens/>.

9 Animal Welfare Act 2006 (England and Wales), s 9; Animal Health and Welfare (Scotland) Act 2006, s 24; Welfare of Animals Act (Northern Ireland) 2011, s 9.

that the freedom of movement of animals “not be restricted in such a way as to cause them unnecessary suffering or injury” would appear to sit uncomfortably with the lived reality of hens and sows confined in these cages.<sup>10</sup>

A complete phase-out of these intensive confinement systems would be in accord with international best practice. Farrowing crates are already banned in Sweden, Norway, and Switzerland,<sup>11</sup> and following a successful judicial review brought by two animal welfare charities<sup>12</sup> the New Zealand government recently introduced new regulations phasing out the use of farrowing crates by 2025.<sup>13</sup> Similarly, enriched cages are already banned in Luxembourg and Austria, and Germany, Slovakia and the Czech Republic have also committed to phasing them out.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, in a landmark decision, last month the European Commission announced its intention to propose legislation by the end of 2023 to ban the use of cages in farming, including farrowing crates and enriched cages.<sup>15</sup> The European Commission's decision, which was in response to the European Citizens' Initiative (ECI), 'End the Cage Age', a petition which obtained almost 1.4 million signatories across the EU, aims to phase in the ban by 2027.<sup>16</sup> The EU will also consider “introducing rules or standards for imported products that are equivalent to the

EU's”.<sup>17</sup> If the UK government genuinely wants to be a world leader in animal welfare, it is important that it follows the lead of these nations.

---

<sup>10</sup> See the Welfare of Farmed Animals (England) Regulations 2007, Schedule 1, s 9; the Welfare of Farmed Animals (Scotland) Regulations 2010, Schedule 1, s 9; the Welfare of Farmed Animals (Wales) Regulations, Schedule 1, s 9; the Welfare of Farmed Animals Regulations (Northern Ireland), Schedule 1, s 9.

<sup>11</sup> RSPCA Assured “What are Farrowing Crates?”, available at <https://www.rspcaassured.org.uk/farm-animal-welfare/pigs/what-are-farrowing-crates/>.

<sup>12</sup> See *New Zealand Animal Law Association v Attorney-General* [2020] NZHC 3009.

<sup>13</sup> Animal Welfare (Care and Procedures) Amendment Regulations (No 2) 2020 (New Zealand).

<sup>14</sup> See Compassion in World Framing “End the Cage Age” at page 7.

<sup>15</sup> See Pig World “European Commission confirms legislation to ban cages in farming” (30 June 2021), available at <https://www.pig-world.co.uk/news/european-commission-confirms-legislation-to-ban-cages-in-farming.html>.

<sup>16</sup> See Euro Group for Animals “European Commission announces historic commitment to ban cages for farmed animals” (30 June 2021), available at <https://www.eurogroupforanimals.org/news/european-commission-announces-historic-commitment-ban-cages-farmed-animals>.

---

<sup>17</sup> Ibid.

# Response to the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (England) Regulations 2015 Post Implementation Review, January 2021

By Paula Sparks, Chairperson, UK Centre for Animal Law

*"We have a long history of detailed rules to protect animals when they are killed or slaughtered, including the recent introduction of mandatory CCTV in slaughterhouses. Following our recent review of the welfare at slaughter legislation, we will be considering what further welfare at slaughter improvements should be made."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.13*

## What is this review and why has it been carried out?

Council Regulation (EC) No. 1099/2009 on the protection of animals at the time of killing ('the EC regulation') is implemented and enforced in the UK by the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (England) Regulations 2015 ('WATOK'). It continues to remain in force until the end of the transition period and will then become retained law under the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018.

Regulation 46 of WATOK requires a review to be carried out five years after the regulations came into force. The government was therefore under a statutory duty to publish a report by 5<sup>th</sup> November 2020.

The review requires the government broadly to consider the objectives (that the requirements of the EU Regulation are being met and there is no overall reduction in the existing animal welfare

standards) to be achieved by the EU Regulation, whether those objectives are achieved, if those objectives remain appropriate and, if so, the extent to which they could be achieved in a less burdensome way; and how they are enforced.

## National rules going beyond the EU Regulation

The EU regulation (Article 26) permitted Member States to retain existing national rules, that were stricter than the Regulation. Schedules 1-4 of WATOK set out the stricter national rules that apply in relation to (i) slaughterhouses, (ii) killing animals other than in a slaughterhouse, (iii) killing animals in accordance with religious rites and (iv) killing animals other than those to whom the EU Regulation applies.

We highlight two of those areas which concern matters of legislative reform that A-LAW has considered: species outside the EU regulation and killing in accordance with religious rites:

### (1) Species not covered by the EU Regulation, but protected under existing national law (for example, crustaceans and decapods)

The review simply notes that 'There are calls from welfare non-government bodies for decapods and cephalopods to be considered sentient creatures and thus subject to animal welfare rules. Sentience is beyond the scope of this review, however any animals which are kept for food production and which are capable of feeling pain, distress or suffering are already protected under WATOK (see in particular paragraph 4 of Schedule 4).'

*A-LAW comments: in our view this is weak. Whilst WATOK, paragraph 4, schedule 4 extends a general level of protection from avoidable pain, distress and suffering at the time of killing, it lacks detailed guidance<sup>1</sup> and it is unclear if it is enforced properly or at all. The review fails to grapple with this issue.*

### (2) Killing and religious rites

<sup>1</sup> A-LAW raised this with the Food Standards Agency when responding to a consultation into Revision of the Guidance for the Home Slaughter of Livestock in England and Wales. See the Summary Report of Stakeholders Responses, Page 12 - [https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/consultation-responses-revision-of-the-guidance-for-the-home-slaughter-of-livestock\\_1.pdf](https://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/media/document/consultation-responses-revision-of-the-guidance-for-the-home-slaughter-of-livestock_1.pdf)



The EU Regulation permits animals to be slaughtered without pre-stunning if religious rites require killing by a religious method and the slaughter takes place in a slaughterhouse. The review notes that the percentage of poultry killed without stunning (including 'broiler' chickens stunned with non-Annex 1 stun parameters) has risen from 4% in 2011 to 10% in 2018 and sheep from 10% in 2011 to 25% in 2018, while over the same period non-stun cattle has fallen from 3% to 1% in England and Wales [FSA Survey Reports].

The review highlights concern about non-stun slaughter:

'A number of stakeholders have reiterated to us long held views that slaughter without pre-stunning should be banned. But in the absence of such a ban have suggested actions such as requiring an immediate post-cut stun for cattle, sheep, goats and deer; ensuring supply is not in excess of local demand; ending the export of meat from non-stunned animals; ensuring greater transparency of data regarding ani-

mals slaughtered without stunning; introducing method of slaughter labelling; and introducing assurances for religious communities about recoverable stunning practices.' [para. 161].

'There have been calls for government to tighten the intention that meat from non-stun religious slaughter be destined for religious markets and not the general consumer. Religious slaughter must be performed by a Jew or Muslim who holds a licence to slaughter animals by the Jewish or Muslim method for the food of Jews or Muslims respectively. The Government would expect the industry to provide consumers with information on which to make an informed choice about their food. It has been suggested by stakeholders that this will require compulsory labelling and supply and demand requirements for meat from non-stun slaughter.' [para 168].

A related issue is that WATOK in England does not require the detailed parameters for stunning set out in Annex 1 of the EC Regulation for religious slaughter. By contrast, the equivalent legislation in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ire-

land does require adherence to Annex 1. The review notes that according to the Food Standards Agency survey of slaughter methods (2018) revealed around 1,000,000 birds were stunned with electrical parameters outside those required in Annex 1, during one week.

The Animal Welfare Committee recommends:

- 'Applying parameters from Annex I of 1099/2009 for stunned Halal slaughter to avoid ineffective stunning (WATOK)
- Tightening the intention that meat from non-stun religious slaughter be destined for religious markets and not the general consumer, which might also bring in labelling and supply and demand requirements for meat from non-stun slaughter.
- Re-examining the standstill times before further movement/processing after the neck cut to reflect the science, particularly for bovines (WATOK);
- Animals that do not become unconscious following a neck cut should be subject to a post cut intervention stun. This would preferably be immediately after the cut, but if this should not prove possible then a stun should be mandated if bleed out was not causing unconsciousness in a reasonable time (WATOK).'

*A-LAW comments: In written submissions to the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs Committee's inquiry into Public Sector Procurement of Food (dated 27.08.2020), A-LAW raised similar concerns about the wide interpretation of the EU regulation to enable non-stun slaughter methods for the export market and for public sector catering markets and to create a single supply chain for a diverse population.*

*A-LAW also has concerns about the exemption in England from the detailed parameters for stunning set out in Annex 1 of the EU regulation. Inadequate stunning risks immobilizing birds, but not rendering them unconscious or insensible to pain. Gudrun Ravetz, senior vice-president of the BVA in 2018 states: 'The lack of evidence-based parameters for waterbath stunning of poultry means English regulations are simply not fit for purpose and could call into question our claim as a leader in high animal welfare.' Quoted Independent, Sunday 18 March 2018 13:09.<sup>2</sup>*

<sup>2</sup> [https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/chickens-slaughterhouses-effective-stunning-england-wales-ani-](https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/chickens-slaughterhouses-effective-stunning-england-wales-animals-rights-uk-a8221591.html)

## Suggestions for improvement

The review provided an opportunity for stakeholders to identify improvements to legislation protecting the welfare of animals at the time of killing. Some of the key areas raised by stakeholders:

### (1) Electrical waterbath stunning of poultry:

Stakeholders, scientific committees (including the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA)) and researchers point to welfare problems associated with inversion and shackling of live birds for electrical waterbath stunning and there have been calls for a ban. EFSA recommendations to phase out electrical water baths across Europe have not been acted upon due to economic considerations. Defra pointed to research co-funded with CIWF into upright head only stunning of poultry and to other suggestions, including further guidance on electrical waterbath stunning parameters.

### (2) Gas stunning of pigs: 86% of pigs in England and Wales were stunned with high concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> in 2018. This is an increase from 50% in 2013. The review acknowledges that in 2003 the Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) recommended that high concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> should be phased out within 5 years and in 2004 the EFSA recommended that gas used to induce unconsciousness should be non-aversive. A Defra sponsored study into low atmospheric pressure stunning did not show an improvement in animal welfare and the review states that conversely, it 'has heightened concern about the current use of high CO<sub>2</sub> in stunning pigs.' The review suggests that this 'is an area we need to consider further in terms of research into alternative systems for stunning pigs.'

### (3) Slaughter of farmed fish: The review highlights that the EU Regulation only provides a general level of protection for farmed fish from avoidable pain, distress and suffering and there are no detailed protections. This is despite a FAWC opinion in 2014 on the welfare of farmed fish at the time of killing, which made recommendations for detailed protections and, as the review acknowledges, 'even drafting a table of recommended stunning and slaughter methods for different farmed fish species.' The review

[mal-rights-uk-a8221591.html](https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/chickens-slaughterhouses-effective-stunning-england-wales-animals-rights-uk-a8221591.html)

notes that in 2018 the European Commission produced a report on stunning and slaughter in farmed fish, but declined to introduce new legislation, relying instead on codes of practice. The Animal Welfare Committee and stakeholder animal welfare groups are amongst those calling for detailed provisions for farmed fish at slaughter.

The Animal Welfare Committee recommends that 'Farmed fish should have specific protections for them under welfare at slaughter legislation.'

*A-LAW comment: in each of these areas (methods of farmed fish, electric waterbath stunning of poultry and high concentrations of CO<sub>2</sub> in pigs), the legislation fails to reflect the best available animal welfare science. The evidence suggests that largely the scientific advice has not been followed due to economic concerns, rather than any dispute with the science. The government has failed to follow recommendations from its own scientific advisory body, as have successive governments in the past.*

## Miscellaneous

We note that at paragraph 27, the evidence cited for dropping the 'stunning out of sight' requirement for sheep and pigs is based upon studies published in 1996 and 1997 respectively. We are surprised that no more recent research is cited. At paragraph 86, we note that this case<sup>3</sup> has now been decided in the Supreme Court and the strict liability of the nature of the offence has been upheld.

## Offences, penalties and enforcement

The review highlights the recommendation of the Animal Welfare Committee that WATOK penalties for causing avoidable pain, distress or suffering should be increased to a maximum custodial term of 5 years, bringing it in line with anticipated changes to offences under the Animal Welfare Act 2006. [para 175].

In relation to enforcement generally, the review also highlights that 'The Animal Welfare Committee would also like to see strengthened en-

forcement by the relevant enforcement bodies on existing welfare problems identified at slaughter and killing (e.g. animals unfit to travel; dead on arrival; injuries in catching, transport and at slaughterhouses; transported in the late stages of pregnancy; thermal stress in transport/lairage and overstocking; lack of water; handling issues in slaughterhouses; ineffective stunning/bleeding).'

*A-LAW comment: A-LAW supports increased sentencing powers for WATOK offences. Sentencing provisions for animal welfare offences are currently out of kilter with public expectations and the sentencing regime in general. A-LAW also supports the observations made in relation to enforcement and enforcement mechanisms.*

## Conclusions and next steps

The review notes that it is an objective of the government to 'actively seek animal welfare improvements and be a world leader in animal welfare standards.'

In relation to possible future action, the report notes:

'There have also been a number of suggestions from stakeholders submitted in the course of this review that might lead to future improvements in legislation on the welfare of animals at the time of killing (see also paragraphs 192-220). The post implementation review recommends the "retain" option for the WATOK regulations, but the Government will consider these issues and suggestions for improvements to the legislation in the course of its policy development.'

*A-LAW comment: We would like to see the government act upon the recommendations made by stakeholder animal welfare groups and others for legislative reform to ensure that animals are properly protected at the time of killing. The review highlights a number of areas where the law does not reflect scientific advice and animal welfare is undisputedly compromised as a result.*

---

3 R (on the application of Highbury Poultry Farm Produce Ltd) (Appellant) v Crown Prosecution Service (Respondent) [2020] UKSC 39

# Fish Welfare

By Amro Hussain, The Humane League UK

On May 12<sup>th</sup>, 2021, the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) published its Action Plan for Animal Welfare. This plan outlines the Government's aims and ambitions for animal welfare domestically and internationally. It mentions several improvements that the Government would like to introduce, such as banning the live export of animals for slaughter and fattening, and taking forward legislation on puppy smuggling. The Humane League UK (THL UK) welcomes this plan, but the organisation is concerned that it does not mention the welfare of farmed fishes or their treatment at the time of killing.

In the UK, fishes are farmed in huge numbers, second only to broiler chickens, with up to 77 million farmed fishes slaughtered every year. The science indicates that slaughter without stunning, such as through live gutting or asphyxiation, can cause fish extreme pain and prolonged suffering. **There are, however, no explicit requirements for the stunning of fishes at the time of slaughter in the UK.**

Under The Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing Regulations (WATOK) England (2015), fishes must be spared any "avoidable pain, distress or suffering during their killing and related operations." However, there are no further details on what constitutes "avoidable pain". Fishes are also not included in the definition of 'animal' for the purpose of the more detailed provisions in WATOK. This means there are no specific requirements on how suffering can be avoided during slaughter.

This is markedly different to the case of terrestrial farm animals, which all have detailed requirements in law for their treatment at the time of slaughter. This vague regulatory framework for fishes means that there are no real requirements at slaughter and that there is significant scope for abuse. Recent investigations by [Animal Equality](#) and [Viva!](#) highlight the cruelty many fishes experience at the time of killing.

The Action Plan for Animal Welfare states that "following our recent review of the welfare at

slaughter legislation...[DEFRA] will be considering what further welfare at slaughter improvements should be made."

Therefore, THL UK is calling on the Government to amend the existing WATOK legislation to explicitly state the requirement to stun fishes at the time of slaughter, and to provide detailed information on stunning methods and how fishes must be treated at the time of killing. This change was recommended by the DEFRA Farmed Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) in 2014 and will bring the legislative requirements for fishes in line with the legislative requirements for terrestrial farm animals.

The Government's Action Plan for Animal Welfare states that "our departure from the EU has provided us with an opportunity to do things better[...] We will continue to raise the bar, and we intend to take the rest of the world with us." However, several European countries have already introduced legal stunning requirements for fishes ahead of the UK. Even Norway, the world's largest producer of salmon, has regulations which require fishes to be electrically stunned at the time of killing.

**Therefore, if the UK is to live up to its commitment to be at the forefront of animal welfare standards globally, it must introduce detailed legislative requirements for the stunning of fishes at the time of slaughter.**

# Companion Animals

## Puppy Imports

By Edie Bowles, Advocates for Animals

*“One of our key reforms here is to end the abhorrent, cruel practice of puppy smuggling and low-welfare pet imports. Now the Transition Period has finished, and we have left the EU, we have the opportunity to go further than ever. We have been working closely with our colleagues across the Devolved Administrations and NGOs to provide protection for those animals brought in by these unscrupulous traders, and to prevent the trade as much as we can.”*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.14*

In its Action Plan for Animal Welfare, published in May 2021<sup>1</sup>, the Government committed to increase the minimum age that dogs can be non-commercially moved or commercially imported into Great Britain. This proposal has the potential to disincentivize both a legal and illegal trade and to close the loopholes within the ban on third party puppy selling, otherwise known as Lucy's Law.

### Current framework

The legal framework that regulates the commercial sale of puppies can be broken down on a domestic and international import basis and

on what is regulated, unregulated and illegal.

#### *Domestic*

Domestically the puppy trade in England (and soon to be Scotland and Wales) is regulated by essentially banning third party selling, this means dogs must be with their biological mothers when they are sold. In addition breeders have a maximum number of litters they can breed and sell. There are still some unregulated aspects of the trade, such as the selling of surplus puppies from a pet dog and illegal puppy farming and third party selling that still takes place.

#### *International imports*

In terms of imports into the UK, the picture is far less clear and fraught with inconsistencies and loopholes.

If dogs needed to be seen with their biological mothers before being sold, it is difficult to see how the commercial import of puppies could continue. Therefore, to allow the trade to continue, Defra is currently interpreting the relevant provisions on certain dog breeding practices under The Animal Welfare (Licensing of Activities Involving Animals) (England) Regulations 2018 (LAIA), mentioned above, as only applying to domestic sale and not international imports.

This means that the import of puppies for sale is regulated by two frameworks 1) the requirement for a pet shop licence under LAIA, which is far less stringent than a breeding licence would be, for example there are no maximum litter numbers or a requirement to see the mother and 2) the Balai Directive, which is largely to protect public health through a series of animal health measures, than to protect animal welfare.

In addition, the trade is also riddled with illegality, including overt and covert puppy smuggling. Covert smuggling simply involves hiding the

<sup>1</sup> [Action Plan for Animal Welfare - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/97203/action-plan-for-animal-welfare.pdf)





puppies at border control. Overt puppy smuggling is when puppies are being brought into the country for commercial trade, but under the guise of being a pet.

### Why this matters

It is not possible to estimate the scale of legal and illegal puppy imports; however, one thing for certain is that it is large and growing. Estimates put the trade at 1.3 billion Euros over 12 EU Member states<sup>2</sup> and £130 million UK-wide.<sup>3</sup> In addition, the demand for puppies over lockdown increased significantly. The RSPCA's submission to an EFRA enquiry into puppy smuggling in 2020 stated:

*During lockdown, Google searches for 'Puppies near me' increased more than six times (650%) with 15,000 searches in July 2020 compared to 2,000 in January 2020. The figure was also five times higher than the same month last year (July 2019). This resulted in a*

*reported shortage of puppies and the price increased dramatically in a short period of time. For example, internet searches found prices of French bulldogs increased from the usual price of £1500-2000 to £7000.<sup>4</sup>*

English breeders have been unable to satisfy the demand and as such there has been a sharp rise in the commercial import of dogs, shown through an increase in the number of Intra-Trade Animal Health Certificates issued.

This rise in imports, the scale of which is not fully known due to the fact multiple dogs can come under one certificate and illegal smuggling is by its nature hard to measure, has meant that dogs are being sold in the UK, which have been bred in conditions, which would not be permitted had they been bred in this country. There are also the welfare concerns with travelling long distances and a real risk of zoonotic diseases. A very public incident of the issues attached to puppy imports happened in 2020 when reality star Molly Mae's imported pomeranian puppy died soon

2 IBF International Consulting et al. 2016

3 Wyatt et al. 2017

4 [https://committees.parliament.uk/written-evidence/14875/html/#\\_ftn5](https://committees.parliament.uk/written-evidence/14875/html/#_ftn5)

after arrival.

## **Solution**

The most robust solution would be to ban the commercial import of puppies into the UK. Failing that, Defra's solution to increase the minimum age on imports is the next best thing. Increasing the minimum age to six months allows better detection of the age of the puppy, which is hard to do before that point. Increasing the minimum age also takes away the desirability factor attached to the cuteness of a puppy, which will fade as they age and result in an influx of dogs to rescue centres. This minimum age should not apply to rescued dogs that are being re-homed in the UK.

**Postscript: On 21st August 2021, DEFRA announced<sup>5</sup> a public consultation on proposals to increase the minimum importation age of puppies from 15 weeks to six months of age. The proposal would apply across Great Britain.**

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-powers-to-tackle-cruel-puppy-smuggling-move-step-closer>

# An analysis of the Kept Animals Bill: Importation

By Molly O'Donoghue, Law Graduate & A-LAW Volunteer

*"[W]e will legislate to:*

*• Reduce the number of pet dogs, cats and ferrets that can be moved under the pet travel rules which apply to non-commercial movements, in order to prevent unscrupulous traders from exploiting our pet travel rules.*

*• Bring in powers which enable us to go further, to:*

*• Increase the minimum age that dogs can be non-commercially moved or commercially imported into Great Britain.*

*• Restrict the ability of unscrupulous traders to move heavily pregnant dogs into Great Britain both commercially and noncommercially.*

*• Prioritise the health and welfare of dogs by prohibiting the importation and non-commercial movement of dogs into Great Britain that have been subject to low welfare practices, such as ear cropping or tail docking, in line with our domestic legislation on these practices."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.14*

The Bill proposes to reduce the maximum number of animals that can be transported under PETS in a motor vehicle to five. The number of animals that can be imported into GB through

other means of transportation is reduced to three. Currently, PETS permits five dogs to travel *per person* into the UK. This means that 10-15 dogs can enter the UK in one vehicle with two or three individuals. Compounding this, dealers are able to repeatedly travel under PETS because there is no record kept of which dogs are moved. These shortcomings enable unscrupulous dealers to make substantial profit with relative ease, significantly facilitating the illegal puppy trade. The Dogs Trust has estimated that some dealers made over £100,000 per year by transporting dogs every week under PETS, well before the prices for some breeds reached a record high in 2020. The Government's plan to restrict the number of puppies that can travel under PETS to five per non-commercial consignment is therefore a step in the right direction. Presumably, the intention is to enable families to travel with their pet whilst protecting against the smuggling of puppies under the guise of owned pets. Relatedly, the Bill empowers Ministers to make provision for the keeping records or information, which could prevent repeat travel under PETS.

The Bill includes powers for the Government to bring in further restrictions on the movement of pets on welfare grounds. For instance, in 2012, changes were made to PETS to harmonise the regime with the rest of Europe, and it became possible to legally import puppies into the UK at fifteen weeks or older, compared to the previous minimum age of ten months. The number of dogs entering GB under PETS increased by 61% in the first year following the relaxation in the age requirement, suggesting that unscrupulous dealers began taking advantage of the new regime. The Bill empowers ministers to increase the minimum age that dogs can be imported into the country through regulation. This will make importing puppies less lucrative and make it easier to spot underage pups being brought into the country.

Despite it being illegal to transport a pregnant dog in the last 10% of her pregnancy, pregnant bitches are being imported into GB, so that their puppies can be sold at a younger age as 'born in GB'. The Bill empowers ministers to make regulations further prohibiting/restricting the movement of pregnant bitches.

Welfare organisations such as the RSPCA are



reporting a stark increase of dogs coming into their care with mutilations such as cropped ears. Cropped ears are becoming more desirable due to a growing number of celebrities owning them. Ear cropping is painful and unnecessary. The only reason that dogs have their ears cropped is aesthetic – it makes them look more intimidating. Ear cropping is detrimental to dogs' health, behaviour, and welfare both in the short-term and in the long-term, particularly because it may negatively affect their hearing, and cause difficulties with communication and body language. Ear cropping is illegal in the UK; however, it is not an offence to import a dog with cropped ears if its ears were cropped in a country where the practice is legal. Thus, it is welcomed that the Bill specifically empowers the Government to make regulations restricting the import of these dogs and dogs with other mutilations, such as docked tails, or any other procedure which involves interference with the sensitive tissues or bone structure of the animal, otherwise than for the purpose of its medical treatment.

The pandemic has further highlighted the need

for robust regulation and enforcement in relation to illegal importation; with demand soaring, more puppies are being imported than ever before. The Dogs Trust rescued 140 illegally imported puppies through their 'Puppy Pilot' scheme between March and September 2020, a 63% increase from the same period in 2019. Where puppies are seized at the borders, the owner can reclaim the puppy by paying the quarantine fees, and then sell the puppy on for profit. Prior to lockdown, reclamation rates by owners were steady at around 5%. During lockdown, however, upwards of 90% of puppies being reclaimed for resale. Through the Puppy Pilot scheme, the Dogs Trust provides invaluable support to the agencies on the ground at ports by funding the care of seized puppies and bitches, as there are insufficient resources available to cover staffing and quarantine costs. However, the Dogs Trust cannot feasibly run this operation across all UK ports, nor should they be expected to. Thus, it is welcomed that the Bill empowers the Government to make provision about relevant animals that are seized and detained by virtue of having been unlawfully imported, in particular, provi-

sion enabling ownership of a relevant animal to be transferred in specified circumstances.

Illegal puppy importation is a trade that is susceptible to the involvement of organised crime groups. The primary reason for this is that it returns a high profit and is low risk, with the maximum sentence under PETS, if caught, being three months imprisonment. When compared with the maximum sentence for smuggling cigarettes, seven years, puppy importation is an attractive option for criminals. The woefully inadequate penalties mean that criminals involved in illegal puppy importation are unfazed. Brexit provided a crucial opportunity for the Government to introduce tougher penalties deter these criminals, and this Bill appears to be an attempt at this as it enables the Government to make regulations permitting monetary penalties to be imposed in cases involving the contravention of any enactment that relates to animal welfare or animal health and is concerned with the importation of relevant animals. Additionally, the Bill provides that Ministers can enact regulations creating criminal offences in relation to the importation of puppies and dogs that breach the relevant regulations. Where this occurs, the provision must have the effect that the offence is 1. triable summarily only, or 2. triable summarily or on indictment; the offence is punishable only 1. with a fine, or 2. with a term of imprisonment or a fine (or both); any term of imprisonment with which the offence is punishable on summary conviction does not exceed 1. in England and Wales, the relevant maximum term; 2. in Scotland, 12 months; any term of imprisonment with which the offence is punishable on 30 conviction on indictment does not exceed 5 years.

The Bill empowers the Government to confer functions on 'specified persons', including powers of inspection, search, seizure or detention (whether or not on the authority of a warrant) as well as powers of entry (regulations may only confer a power of entry to a private dwelling without the consent of the occupier, or with the use of reasonable force, on the authority of a warrant issued by a justice of the peace in England and Wales, or the authority of a warrant issued by a sheriff or a justice of the peace in Scotland) and monetary penalties. This has the potential to assist with enforcement, provided such powers are conferred to the appropriate

people/organisations. Moreover, the Bill enables Ministers to make provision for the revocation of a person's licence, authorisation, or other approval required by or under any enactment for the importation of relevant animals, where: 1. the person contravenes a provision of the regulations, or 2. the person obstructs, or fails to assist in, the exercise of a function conferred by the regulations.

**Postscript: On 21st August 2021, DEFRA announced<sup>1</sup> a public consultation on proposals to ban the importation of 1. dogs with cropped ears and tails, and 2. pregnant dogs who are more than 42 days pregnant. The proposals would apply across Great Britain.**

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/news/new-powers-to-tackle-cruel-puppy-smuggling-move-step-closer>

# Dog theft on the rise: How in danger is your pet and what can be done about it?

By Daniel Allen, Animal Geographer, Keele University

[Republished from The Conversation](#)

*“We will crack down on pet theft, which is reported to have increased markedly since the start of the pandemic, knowing the devastating impact this offence, and the fear of it, can have on families and pet owners. We have worked across-government to set up a taskforce to tackle this issue.”*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.15*

Dog theft has a devastating impact on people and families and is a known gateway to animal cruelty and extortion. Yet very few criminals get caught, let alone charged.

Some victims point to police inaction, others to the courts. But the reality is that the law informs police priorities and resources, and the sentencing of magistrates. The law has also made dog theft a low-risk, high-reward crime which continues to rise in the UK.

Under the Theft Act 1968, animal companions are legally regarded as inanimate objects when stolen – their sentience and role within the family are not taken into consideration. Nor is pet theft recognised in the Animal Welfare Act 2006. Dog theft crime, and pet theft more generally, is therefore not a specific offence. Instead, stolen pets come under other theft offences such as burglary or theft from a person. Bicycle theft, on the other hand, is recognised as its own offence.

This means police records on dog theft are not

included in crime statistics, and the only way to access such information is through Freedom of Information (FOI) requests to individual police forces.

## The facts

Over the years, stolen dog figures have been collected by insurance companies and charities and shared by the media, helping to raise awareness of the growing issue. These statistics, however, are always incomplete as police forces do not use a standardised approach to recording pet theft.

This means that gathering data from crime recording systems can be time consuming and expensive. The FOI response from Police Scotland, for example, states their systems “do not offer the capability to search according to property stolen”; this is much the same for police forces in Wiltshire, Hampshire and Sussex.

My forthcoming study, which includes complete FOI statistics for 39 of 44 police forces in England and Wales, found that recorded dog theft crimes rose from 1,545 in 2015 to 1,849 in 2018 – a rise of nearly 20%. Meanwhile, there was a fall in charges related to dog theft crimes: 64 in 2015 to 20 in 2018 – a reduction of nearly 70% (68.7%). In 2018, the police forces with the most dog theft crimes were: Metropolitan (London) (256), West Yorkshire (167), Greater Manchester (145), Merseyside (117), and Kent (108). But overall, only 1% of dog theft crime cases investigated resulted in a charge in England and Wales.

Under the Theft Act 1968, sentencing is dependent on the monetary value of the stolen animal (under or above £500), and the crime is treated as a category three (fine to two years in custody) or four offence (fine to 36 weeks in custody) in magistrates court.

The Ministry of Justice has rejected multiple FOI requests to establish what exact sentences have been handed down, but media reports show what some dog thieves are receiving if caught. Pet theft is on the rise. But few cases are brought to justice.

In June 2018, a gang of four were tried at Lincoln Crown Court for stealing 15 Cavalier King

Charles spaniels from a Lincolnshire breeder. Only one of the dogs was later recovered and reunited with its owner, having been thrown from a moving vehicle. All four of the accused pleaded guilty to theft – and the gang members received suspended sentences of between 12 and 16 months.

In December 2018, a dog thief who pleaded guilty at Leicester Magistrates Court to stealing two pugs named Betty and Harry and was ordered to pay £200 compensation, £400 costs and received a drugs rehabilitation order – the stolen dogs remain missing.

In February 2019, an Amazon driver who stole miniature schnauzer Wilma when delivering dog food was given a 12-month community order by magistrates in High Wycombe.

Pixie, an 11-month-old pug, also went missing while being looked after by a family friend in July 2018, and has not been seen since. In September 2019, the dog thief was ordered to pay a £250 fine at Dundee Sheriff Court.

### **Pet theft reform**

There are currently minimal deterrents for stealing dogs, and it seems the government does not take the crime seriously.

The Stolen and Missing Pets Alliance (Sampa), however, is calling for MPs to change this through "Pet Theft Reform" – a campaign which is growing in public and cross-party political support. Campaign petitions in 2018 and 2019 government petitions both passed 100,000 signatures, triggering two parliamentary debates.

Sampa has set out two routes to reform. One is to revise sentencing guidelines in the Theft Act 1968 to "reclassify the theft of a pet to a specific crime in its own right".

Indeed, the Dogs Trust is also lobbying for dog theft to be recognised as a more serious category two offence or above. And according to DEFRA minister George Eustice: "The government interpret the latest guidance from the Sentencing Council that the theft of a pet should generally be treated as a category two or three offence."

Although a positive interpretation, this is not the reality in the courts. Also, the sentencing council will not make any revisions to sentencing unless advised by government.

The second route is to "amend animal welfare law to make pet theft a specific offence" through the Animal Welfare Act 2006. This would ensure courts consider the fear, alarm or distress to sentient animals rather than their monetary value. It would also mean the proposed six-month to five-year sentences for animal cruelty could be used. MP Ross Thomson's Pets Theft Bill made this case – but it failed to complete its passage through parliament before the end of the last session.

It is clear that police recording systems for pet theft need to be standardised; dog theft crime statistics need to be more transparent; more resources must be given to help police enforcement; the theft of sentient animal companions should be differentiated from the theft of inanimate objects; the monetary value of the pet should be made irrelevant, and sentences fitting the severity of the crime should also be available in courts.

The only way the rise in dog theft can be tackled is by implementing pet theft reform to make this crime a specific offence with custodial sentences. Anything less and the damaging upward trend will likely continue.

# An interview about cat micro-chipping with Stefan Blakiston Moore, Advocacy & Government Relations Officer at Cats Protection

By Aaliya Butt, Young Animal Lawyers Network Committee, UK Centre for Animal Law

*"We will introduce compulsory cat microchipping to ensure lost or stolen cats can be reunited with their owners as quickly as possible. In addition, we are reviewing the operation of the current microchip database systems, which also apply to dogs, with a view to introducing improvements."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.15*

## Does Cats Protection support a change in the law to make cat microchipping mandatory?

Yes, Cat Protection has led a campaign for several years, we know from our own statistics from the 'Cats and Their Stats (CATS) report 2020' across the UK there are 2.6 million unchipped cats which equates to around 26% of owned cats. Microchipping is the safe and permanent way for cats to be identified. Cats Protection is keen to ensure all pet cats are chipped.

## What is the problem this seeks to address - what sort of problems does Cat Protection encounter with unchipped cats?

Cats are free to roam and can end up going missing or sadly be involved in road traffic accidents. It is important to ensure that cats are chipped, so that owners can be informed if their cat is sadly found on the road. It is heart-breaking for cat owners not to know the fate of their beloved pets and microchipping offers closure

For Cats Protection it is an important issue because we take in a lot of unchipped cats. 8 out of 10 of the stray cats that come into our adoption centres are unchipped, which equates to thousands of cats every year. We of course do our best to ensure that these pets are reunited with their owners but sadly it's not always possible.

A couple of months ago, we reunited an owner with their cat after 13 years of their cat disappearing, and that is all because of the microchip. If that very cat had not been microchipped, chances that we would have been able to reunite with its owner are slim to none.

Overall, there is an issue with the number of cats being chipped, we know since dog microchipping has been introduced in 2016, percentage of dogs being chipped is around 92%, whereas the percentage of pet cats is stuck at 71% so we really need something to drive that forward.

## Do public bodies who dispose of cats sadly found deceased, have any responsibility to check the microchip, so that the owner can be informed?

Highway England do collect, scan, and notify owners when cats are found on those main roads, but local authorities, are not currently required to.

We did find in June 2019 that 92% of councils do have some arrangements to scan cats, but of course whether the chip company is being contacted and the owner informed is a further issue. We would like to see council's scanning and for best practise guidance to be issued to encourage them to do so, as it's heart-breaking for owners if they cannot learn the fate of their cat and they're left wondering.

## There are currently over 14 databases where pet owners can register their animals, but no central database where all the information is exchanged. Do you think a change in the law will be effective if it is not accompanied by a central database for chip registration?

If your cat is brought to Cat Protection and is chipped, we are going to be able to access that chip number and try and contact you, and as long as your details are kept up-to-date, we should be able to contact you.





Cats Protection supports a review of the existing database systems, we would like to see some improvements made to checking chips to ensure it is as efficient as possible.

**There are also campaigns that advocate for duties on vets to scan animals when first registered at a vet practice and before euthanasia, to confirm legal ownership. Is this something that you would believe would be useful?**

The first thing I would stress, is that Cat Protection would never put a healthy cat to sleep. The priority for us is making sure all cats are chipped to make veterinary scanning effective. We want to make sure all pet cats are chipped, so that if they are scanned, the owner can be identified. This has been the key focus of our campaign, but veterinary guidance has recently been introduced, to ensure healthy dogs are scanned before euthanasia, and when compulsory microchipping is introduced, we would like to see guidance on scanning extended to include cats.

We do recognise that vets may have been treat-

ing an animal for many years and it is important to allow vets to use their judgement.

**Is there anything else you would like to mention?**

After many years of campaigning, Cats Protection is delighted that the Government have committed to introducing compulsory microchipping in their Action Plan for Animal Welfare. It will make such a difference to all those charities such as ourselves, where we are taking in so many unchipped cats and help more owners be reunited with their beloved pets should they go missing.

# Wild Animals

## Banning the private keeping of primates

By Randi J. Milgram & Michelle Strauss, Co-chair Companion Animal Law Working Group, UK Centre for Animal Law

*"We will legislate to prohibit primates as pets and potentially other animals. Keepers that are able to provide welfare standards akin to those of licensed zoos will be able to keep their primates under a new licensing regime, subject to conditions and inspections. Ownership of these exotic animals with complex needs will be phased out for keepers unable to meet these standards. We are considering whether these restrictions should apply to other wild animals that are kept as pets."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.17*

Primates are intelligent animals that live in complex social groups, and so keeping primates as companion animals has led to many welfare concerns. There is a significant body of scientific research that has shown that primates kept in private homes have impaired welfare.<sup>1</sup> All

species in this diverse group are wild, and attempts to domesticate them are harmful to their well-being. For this reason, when the government consulted on a potential ban on the keeping of primates as pets earlier this year, A-Law made submissions indicating its support of such a change. The subsequent inclusion of this ban in the Animal Welfare (Kept Animals) Bill is welcomed.

We believe that the welfare of primates should be the foremost consideration when determining their suitability and prospective status as pets. A-Law supports the Government's announced prohibition on the private keeping of primates and expects that the law in full will also prohibit private breeding, acquisition, gifting, selling, or transfer of primates. Keeping primates as pets, whilst ensuring that the animals' welfare needs are met, is an enormously difficult task. Indeed, there is a strong argument that the private keeping of primates outside of carefully managed sanctuary or zoo settings will almost certainly be inconsistent with good welfare outcomes for the primates.<sup>2</sup> One particular comprehensive study of primates kept as pets, completed by leading voices from the University of Bristol School of Biological Sciences and the RSPCA, concluded based on extensive research that primates are not suitable as pets, because, among other reasons, their welfare needs could not be adequately addressed in the average domestic setting.<sup>3</sup> Welfare concerns stem from most pro-

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Soulsbury, C.D. et al., The Welfare and Suitability of Primates Kept as Pets. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, Vol. 12, Issue 1, 2009; Johnson-Delaney, C. A. (1991). The pet monkey: Health care and husbandry guidelines. *Journal of Small Exotic Animal Medicine*, 1, 32-37; Huemer, H. P., et al. (2002). Fatal infection of a pet monkey with Human herpesvirus 1. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 8, 639-641; Mott,

Maryann. "The Perils of Keeping Monkeys as Pets." *National Geographic*, September 16, 2003; Chimps as Pets: The Reality. Jane Goodall Institute UK. <https://www.janegoodall.org.uk/chimpanzees/chimpanzee-central/15-chimpanzees/chimpanzee-central/28-chimps-as-pets-the-reality>; Primate Incidents. Humane Society US. Available at: <https://www.humanesociety.org/sites/default/files/docs/primate-escapes-and-attacks.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup> Soulsbury, C.D. et al., The Welfare and Suitability of Primates Kept as Pets. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, Vol. 12, Issue 1, 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Soulsbury, C.D. et al., The Welfare and Suitability of Primates Kept as Pets. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, Vol. 12, Issue 1, 2009.



spective owners' lack of necessary knowledge about the animal's care requirements. Presently, there is no requirement that owners of primates have a good understanding of their particular needs. As a consequence, many owners are woefully unprepared for the enormous amount of work that caring for primates entails.

As with most pets, owners prefer to acquire them very young, which means they are separated from their mother and unable to form bonds and learn necessary behaviours, leading to long-term psychological problems.<sup>4</sup> This desire to acquire the primates at a young age also presents other practical difficulties. Primates, unlike dogs and cats, need 24-hour care, much like a baby. Yet infant primates present particular challenges because, unlike human babies, they are far more mobile from a young age and can also cause considerable damage.<sup>5</sup>

Each stage of primate development presents

4 Johnson-Delaney, *supra*.

5 *Id.*

unique challenges to carers. One ongoing practical difficulty is providing suitable nutrition, and an inappropriate diet has proved to have devastating consequences for privately kept primates. Improper diet not only causes nutritional disorders, but it also increases susceptibility to diseases - including diseases of human origin.<sup>6</sup> Fatal transmission of common diseases from humans to primates have been noted,<sup>7</sup> and even something as simple as the common cold can be devastating to a primate.

The freedom and ability to have social interactions and express normal behaviours are just as crucial as diet and environment. In a policy paper discussing great apes from the perspectives of both science and ethics, the Animals & Society Institute concluded that keeping primates in captivity is a violation of both their physi-

6 Johnson-Delaney, C. A. (1991). The pet monkey: Health care and husbandry guidelines. *Journal of Small Exotic Animal Medicine*, 1, 32-37.

7 Huemer, H. P., et al. (2002). Fatal infection of a pet monkey with Human herpesvirus 1. *Emerging Infectious Diseases*, 8, 639-641.

cal and psychological well-being.<sup>8</sup> Primates housed without other primates often have seriously compromised welfare that manifests in self-harm, coprophagia, and even decreases in leukocyte levels.<sup>9</sup> Primates need the freedom to express their natural behaviours, and to grow and develop their strength - and often this means that primates need a great deal of space in which to live. These developmental requirements are often incompatible with life in captivity. Owners who are not zoos or sanctuaries rarely want more than one or two primates to care for, and so pet primates often show behavioural problems due to being the lone primate of their species in their home.

All of these reasons demonstrate why the Government's proposed primate ban is necessary. The vast majority of private keepers lack the sufficient knowledge of how to properly care for a primate, as well as the sufficient means to employ that knowledge. We hope that the Government's definition of what constitutes a licensed zoo-level welfare standard is clearly defined and fully informed with the advice of primate experts.

In other countries that have implemented similar restrictions on private keeping of primates, current owners permitted to keep their animals were forbidden from trading and - crucially - breeding their animals.<sup>10</sup> This important detail is necessary in any legislation that aims to curb the ownership of wild pets in the UK and to curb the illegal pet industry.

Once the regulations come into force, the time period granted for current owners to comply with the regulations must be carefully set. We urge the Government to determine the phase-out period of existing pet primates in accordance with two very serious concerns: 1) The continued welfare failures of primates kept in insufficient private homes by non-specialist keepers must be balanced with 2) the likelihood that

sanctuaries and rescues will be overwhelmed by an influx of former pet primates if non-specialist keepers are rushed to give them up. Considering there are an estimated 5,000 primates kept in UK homes,<sup>11</sup> these spaces could easily be overwhelmed. Zoos do not accept former pets, and while some unwanted primates will find homes in sanctuaries, most end up being resold over and over or sent to laboratories.<sup>12</sup> We fear that private keepers will find sanctuaries without sufficient resources to take in their pet, and will thus resort to less than ideal measures, such as sending to labs for research, or possibly selling/giving to illegal traders. The Government must consider the best methods of handling the population of primates that will no longer be kept as pets, and must ensure that owners have the requisite assistance for complying with the new law. It may be necessary for the Government to provide assistance to primate sanctuaries as well.

Given the issues noted above, if the private ownership of primates is not sufficiently banned, then we believe it is imperative that the UK licensing scheme must be updated and strengthened. Private possession of primates is governed by the Dangerous Wild Animals Act 1976, which originally exempted certain primates from licensing. In October 2007, more species were exempted. Consequently, the number of primates being held under the licensing scheme does not accurately reflect the actual number of captive primates in the UK.<sup>13</sup> Moreover, non-compliance with the licensing scheme is estimated to be a staggering 85-95%.<sup>14</sup> This means that the number of primates held legally and under license represents merely a fraction of the primates being held privately in the UK, with both legally unlicensed animals and illegally held animals unaccounted for. When animals are unaccounted for to such a large degree, it is impossible to comprehend the extent of welfare violations. A 2004 RSPCA study analysed data from 190 veterinarians in England & Wales, finding that primates accounted for 3.5% of the exotic pets they had

8 Capaldo, T. & Bradshaw, G.A., *The Bioethics of Great Ape Well-Being: Psychiatric Injury and Duty of Care*. Animals & Society Institute Policy Paper, 2011.

9 Soulsbury, at p.10.

10 "Major new restrictions on exotic pet keeping." The Animal Protection Agency, February 2, 2015. Cision PR Newswire. Available at: <<https://www.prnewswire.co.uk/news-releases/major-new-restrictions-on-exotic-pet-keeping-in-the-netherlands-raise-hopes-that-uk-will-follow-290526001.html>>

11 RSPCA, *Do You Give a Monkey's? The Need for a Ban on Pet Primates*, 2016. Available at: <[rspca.org.uk/petprimates](http://rspca.org.uk/petprimates)>

12 Mott, Maryann. "The Perils of Keeping Monkeys as Pets." *National Geographic*, September 16, 2003.

13 Soulsbury, *supra*, at 4.

14 *Id.*

treated.<sup>15</sup> This figure is out of proportion to the number of primates known to be kept in the UK, demonstrating a serious problem in the well-being of pet primates. This surprisingly large figure also demonstrates the lack of reliability with the data on pet primates, given the legal loopholes and illegal holdings. The Government must develop more precise methods of determining the number of primates in the UK, to ensure that all primates being kept in private dwellings that do not meet the new licensing standards are indeed accounted for. The new licensing scheme must cover all species of primates so that the authorities may better account for their presence in the UK, monitor their well-being, and enforce all applicable regulations.

---

<sup>15</sup> RSPCA (Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals). (2004). *Handle with care. A look at the exotic animal pet trade.* Horsham, UK.

# Prohibiting glue traps

By Rob Espin & Francesca Nicholls, Wild Animal Law Working Group, UK Centre for Animal Law

*"We will also look to restrict the use of glue traps as a means of pest control to help make sure rodents are despatched in a humane manner. Glue traps can cause immense suffering to rodents and other animals that inadvertently fall victim to their use."*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.18*

Glue traps are an inhumane and indiscriminate way of addressing issues caused by unwanted wildlife and should not form a part of modern wildlife management techniques. Our recent reform [report](#) supports calls for this Government to act on its claims that the UK is a world leader in animal welfare standards by completely prohibiting the sale and use of glue traps, in order to prevent unnecessary suffering to British wildlife.

Glue traps (also known by names including sticky boards, glue boards and adhesive traps) may take several forms but in essence constitute a piece of card or board one side of which is coated in an industrial strength non-setting adhesive. The traps are designed to catch unwanted wildlife (most commonly rodents) and immobilise them by sticking them to the board.

Unfortunately glue traps cause trapped animals immense suffering as the animals become fully entrapped by the adhesive, including their feet, body and head becoming stuck as they attempt to break free. Independent scientific evaluations have demonstrated that even animals' mouths can become glued shut as they attempt to chew themselves free from the traps. As stuck animals desperately fight to break free of the adhesive they frequently collapse exhausted, commonly vocalising pain and/or panic. Trapped animals may die due to broken bones or torn fur from

their attempts to escape, causing severe external and internal bleeding, whilst some animals perish due to suffocation caused by the adhesive blocking airways. Research shows that 85% of mice caught in glue traps remain alive and experience suffering for over 24 hours.

The suffering endured by animals caught in glue traps has led to the British Veterinary Association (the "BVA") issuing a policy statement finding that the welfare implications of glue traps render them inherently inhumane.

Whilst the intention behind glue traps may be to exclusively target and trap rodents, the traps themselves do not discriminate as to which animals they trap. The adhesive used in glue traps will cause many different types of animal to be caught in the trap and suffer the same suffering and sometimes death as rodents. Pets and wildlife sanctuaries have reported members of the public coming to them with birds, cats and even endangered snakes which have become stuck in glue traps. Whilst the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (the "RSPCA") received over 200 reports of animals not considered to be pests stuck in glue traps in the last 5 years, it is very likely that many more animals have been trapped by glue traps and simply have not been found or saved by members of the public therefore their suffering goes unreported.

Our report supports calls for the Government to follow in the footsteps of those other jurisdictions which have legislated to outlaw the sale and use of glue traps by both consumers and industry stakeholders. These jurisdictions set a clear precedent that glue traps should be prohibited due to the extraordinary suffering they cause to animals and that such a prohibition should not be undermined by any form of derogations. Whilst the text of the Glue Traps (Offences) Bill introduced to Parliament by Jane Stevenson MP is not available to us at present, we hope that this bill will act to address these issues or some of them.

A point wider than trapping which this government should carefully explore, is the ethics of the use of the label "pest" to describe rodents. The Scottish Animal Welfare Commission has already disproved the use of the term, stating:



*"The labelling of target species as 'pests' in this context should be discouraged in the future. It is important to recognise that 'pest' animals have the potential to suffer to the same extent as other sentient 'non-pest' species. In considering all 'pest' control methods, the Commission would like to see these ethical considerations higher up the agenda and explicitly addressed in all future discussions".*

The opinion of the Commission is only strengthened by the current passage through Parliament of the Animal Welfare (Sentience) Bill, which explicitly recognises the welfare of all animals as sentient beings. This includes rodents targeted by glue traps. This Government should therefore carefully scrutinise the ability for terms such as "pests" to be used in a commercial and official context.

**Read the Wild Animal Law Working Group's recent report, 'Glue Traps and the Case for Reform', [here](#).**

# Animals in Science

## Animals used in experiments and risk of losing welfare gains

By Dr Rachel Dunn, Northumbria University Law School

*“We will also... I continue to commit to maintaining high standards of protection where procedures are undertaken on live animals for scientific or educational purposes.”*

*- DEFRA Action Plan for Animal Welfare, p.16*

The new 'flagship' Action Plan for Animal Welfare covers many different kinds of animals and issues, from puppy smuggling to farmed animals, but does not mention anything concrete about animals used in experiments. This will most likely be because regulation of animals used in experiments comes from the Home Office and not Defra, but it is disappointing that there is a lack of consideration for them at this time. An issue which has been repeatedly flagged since Brexit negotiations started surrounds Regulation (EC) No. 1907/2006, concerning the Regulation, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH). REACH applies to all substances manufactured or imported into the EU of one ton or more, with the aim of protecting human health and the environment from the risks caused by chemicals. REACH is overseen by the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA), but the responsibility lies with manufacturers and importers to gather information about the properties and hazards of chemicals and register them on the ECHA's central database.

The central database is a benefit of REACH, as 'Registrants may only carry out new tests when they have exhausted all other relevant and available data sources.'<sup>1</sup> This includes the results of any tests carried out on vertebrate animals, with the ECHA clear that any reliable studies on animals must not be repeated. Since leaving the EU, however, the UK have lost their seat on the ECHA Member State Committee and access to the REACH central database.<sup>2</sup> To avoid a gap in the law, as there was no alternative to REACH in the UK, Parliament introduced UK REACH,<sup>3</sup> which retains the key principles of EU REACH. On exit day, UK REACH 'grandfathered' EU REACH where UK Registrants owned the test data, to create their own database, but without the data on the ECHA central database belonging to non-UK Registrants, and EU Registrants are under no obligation to share it with the UK. This means, where there is a lack or loss of data, there is the risk of chemicals already tested on animals in the EU needing to be tested again in the UK to register with UK REACH. McCulloch has highlighted how this can lead to 'unnecessary testing on animals',<sup>4</sup> with others arguing it could 'slow-down' progress of developing non-animal methods of testing.<sup>5</sup>

1 ECHA, 'Animal Testing Under Reach'. Available online: <<https://echa.europa.eu/animal-testing-under-reach>> accessed 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2021

2 Please note that Northern Ireland currently still operate under the EU REACH. This means the UK currently operates under two systems and needs to adhere to both EU and UK REACH in some circumstances.

3 REACH has been retained using the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018, but there are also exit Regulations setting out UK REACH functions: REACH etc (Amendment etc) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, SI 2019/758, REACH etc (Amendment etc) (EU Exit) (No 2) Regulations 2019, SI 2019/858, REACH etc (Amendment etc) (EU Exit) (no 3) Regulations 2019. SI 2019/1144 and REACH etc (Amendment etc) (EU Exit) Regulations 2020, SI 2020/1577.

4 Steven P. McCulloch, 'Brexit and Animal Welfare Impact Assessment: Analysis of the Threats Brexit Poses to Animal Protection in the UK, EU and Internationally' (2019) 9 *Animals* 117

5 Brexit and Animals Taskforce, *Opportunities and Threats: UK Animal Welfare under Different Models of Relations with the European Union (EU)* (2018). Available online: <<https://politicalanimal>





The potential of duplicate testing was discussed during oral evidence given to the Energy and Environment Sub-Committee of the House of Lords, where it was stated that the UK will have to take a regulatory approach and 'if that required animal testing, it would require animal testing'.<sup>6</sup> In a recent Briefing Paper, the concerns surrounding duplicate animal testing was noted, but no solution or guarantees were offered, merely just that the UK will continue to use alternative methods where appropriate.<sup>7</sup> As a result, there has been a push to put provisions into the Environmental Bill 2020,<sup>8</sup> due to frustrations of

---

[org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Brexit-briefing-1.pdf](https://www.parliament.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/Brexit-briefing-1.pdf)  
accessed 12 March 2021

6 Select Committee on the European Union: Energy and Environment Sub-Committee, Corrected Oral Evidence: The Future of REACH and Regulations post-Brexit (H-L 2018 Q25)

7 Elizabeth Rough and Georgina Hutton, Briefing Paper: End of Brexit Transition: Chemicals Regulations (REACH), (2021) House of Commons, Number CBP 8403. Available online: <<https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-8403/>> accessed 4<sup>th</sup> June 2021

8 The Environment Bill has been carried over into the next Parliamentary session and has just completed the 2<sup>nd</sup> reading in the House of Lords at the time of writing: <<https://bills.parliament.uk/bills/2593>> accessed 4<sup>th</sup> June 2021

the lack of animal welfare provisions and the opportunities to decrease the number of animals used in experiments not taken.<sup>9</sup> Thus, a new clause has been added to the Bill, providing that the Secretary of State must set targets for the replacement of tests on animals within the scope of REACH, and for reduction of the numbers of animals used and the suffering they are subjected to, until replacement can be reached.<sup>10</sup>

It is not clear at this time whether the loss of access to the REACH database will cause mass duplicate testing, or if the clause in the Environmental Bill will appear in the final Act and help to mitigate this risk. Further to the ethical arguments, companies should prefer not to have to test on animals for UK REACH, due to the time

---

9 Cruelty Free International, 'UK Environment Bill on Hold Again; Cruelty Free International' (2021). Available online: <<https://www.crueltyfreeinternational.org/what-we-do/latest-news-and-updates/uk-environment-bill-hold-again>> accessed 4<sup>th</sup> June 2021

10 HC Deb 26th January 2021, vol 688, col 288. Available online: <<https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2021-01-26/debates/20CFA026-8E78-4D84-82E4-B4236D826AA4/EnvironmentBill>> accessed 4<sup>th</sup> June 2021

and expense of conducting experiments on animals. Close monitoring of UK REACH and experiments conducted on animals over the next few years should provide the data to make robust conclusions on this issue. The government, however, have been quite reserved on the issue, when releasing the Action Plan and in REACH briefings. What is needed is a strong message that UK REACH will uphold the principle of animal experimentation being a last resort, with realistic timescales for decreasing the number of animals used and for the UK become the leader they want to be in non-animal methodologies.<sup>11</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Innovate UK claimed that the UK could become a leader in non-animal technologies, with a result of emerging technologies and industries 'driving future economic growth' after Brexit: Innovate UK. *A Non-Animal Technologies Roadmap for the UK: Advancing Predictive Biology*; Innovate UK: Swindon, UK, 2015. Available online: <[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/474558/Roadmap\\_NonAnimalTech\\_final\\_09Nov2015.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/474558/Roadmap_NonAnimalTech_final_09Nov2015.pdf)> accessed 4<sup>th</sup> June 2021.

# Animals in Science Working Group: Summary of Activity & Progress, June 2021

**By Simon Brooman, Blanche Koenig, Nadine Leese, Paula Sparks, UK Centre for Animal Law**

Of the many areas of animal use and interaction with humans to be specifically mentioned in the government's post-Brexit Action Plan for Animals (May 2021), those in animal experiments were the most notable absentee. No area has attracted so much attention yet seen so little progress spanning decades than animal experimentation. It is often argued by experimenters and legislators that the United Kingdom benefits from one of the most robust legislative frameworks in the world. However, in the Animals in Science Working Group (ASWG) we occupy different ground which recognises significant concerns in this area.

To illustrate this, in early 2021, we made representations to the Home Office Animals in Science Committee Futures Capability Working Group, which is reviewing the operation and legislative control of the area. This will be supplemented by one of our ASWG attending a Home Office workshop in late July 2021 to discuss representations made during the consultation.

The area has so many weaknesses and flaws that it was difficult to pin down just four in our representations. However, we raised the following areas as those of significant concern and need of reform. The congruent themes of transparency, openness and accountability run through all our suggestions:

1. The need for more transparency and freedom of information in the area. The operation of the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, as amended in 2013, is specifically removed from oversight under the Freedom of Information Act (2000), due to fears over industrial secrecy and alleged potential threats to those working in the area. Section 24 of A(SP)A 1986, prohibits disclosure of sensitive information. However, despite a 2014 government consultation recommending repeal of section 24, it remains a significant bar to transparency in the area. It prevents

scrutiny of experiments after results have emerged, and shrouds, for example, the operation of the infamous severity test, in secrecy. The repeal of section 24 would be a significant milestone and might lead to greater accountability in the area.

2. The theme of accountability runs into our second recommendation – changes to the membership profile of the Animals in Science committee tasked with oversight of the operation of the act. We suggest that the membership has a significant science bias, which prevent proper scrutiny from others with significant expertise in the area. We suggest the expansion of this group to include those from animal welfare groups, local authorities and others to increase public accountability and to provide a better gauge of public morality in decision making.
3. The replacement of scrutiny and collaboration lost after Brexit. Chief amongst our concerns here is the fact that the knowledge shared under the European Union Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals Regulation (No, 1907/2006) (REACH) will be lost. The UK government has committed to a UK version, but this still omits the wealth of knowledge of experimental outcomes from the EU. It leaves open the possibility of significant suffering through ignorance of previous research and is extremely troubling. We also suggest that the oversight of the EU needs to be replicated or replaced in the UK with a body of standing to ask questions and maintain sufficient oversight in the area.
4. Finally, we recommend an overall review of whether the UK employs the best that can be offered in good practice in carrying out experiments on animals. It is chilling to image the suffering caused by poorly designed experiments, without adequate consideration of replacement, reduction and refinement. In tandem with this we also question whether the promotion situation for researchers in universities is driving down the publication of negative results as they seek to hide the outcomes of poorly designed or ineffective experiments. We suggest that wider use of the ARRIVE (2010) (Animals in Research: Reporting In Vivo Experiments) guidelines might help improve the comprehensive reporting of scientific experimentation and improve the welfare of animals as a



result.

Overall, we can see significant challenges that require of us to keep the pressure on to reform the regulation of animal experimentation. We hope that the Animals in Science Committee review will enable us to press the UK government to incorporate animal welfare in experimentation into the promises made post-Brexit.



A-law, c/o Clair Matthews, Monckton Chambers, 1&2  
Raymond Buildings, Grays Inn, London WC1R 5NR  
Email: [info@alaw.org.uk](mailto:info@alaw.org.uk)  
Visit: [www.alaw.org.uk](http://www.alaw.org.uk)  
Follow us on Twitter, Facebook, Instagram & LinkedIn

