



Council of the
European Union

Brussels, 3 April 2024
(OR. en)

8470/24

LIMITE

VETER 50
AGRI 305
AGRILEG 213
CODEC 976

Interinstitutional File:
2023/0447(COD)

WORKING DOCUMENT

From:	General Secretariat of the Council
To:	Delegations
Subject:	Regulation on the welfare of dogs and cats – Articles 18 to 28 and Annex III - Comments from delegations

Delegations will find in annex submissions from delegations on the above subject, concerning drafting suggestions and comments on the proposal for a Regulation on the welfare of dogs and cats put forward after the meeting of the Working Party meeting on 20-21 February 2024.

From: AT, BG, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE, EL, ES, FI, FR, HR, HU, IE, IT, LT, LU, LV, MT, NL, PL, SE, SI, SK

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
CHAPTER IV COMPETENT AUTHORITIES	
<i>Article 18</i>	
<i>Training</i>	EL (Comments): The Commission is empowered to adopt implementing acts in accordance with Article 18 supplementing this Article to lay down further rules on the content of the courses for the training of caretakers
For the purposes of Article 9 Member States shall designate the competent authority responsible for:	BG (Drafting Suggestions): For the purposes of Article 9 Member States shall designate the competent authority authorities responsible for: BG

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(Comments):</p> <p>To enable more than one competent authority, e.g. as the real situation in Bulgaria.</p> <p>DE</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>For the purposes of Article 9 Member States shall designate the competent authorityyies responsible for:</p> <p>DE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>This can also be more than one competent authority. In Germany, for example, responsibility lies with the federal states.</p>
(a) ensuring that training courses are available for animal caretakers;	<p>DK</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>If it is decided that only one animal caretaker should complete a formal course (cf. revised article 9), Denmark suggests that it should be the animal caretaker who has the responsibility for the daily management of the establishment who is obliged to have a formal training course.</p> <p>EL</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>ensuring that training courses <u>on animal welfare, handling, evacuation plan on disasters and first aid for dogs</u></p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p><u>and cats</u> are available for animal caretakers;</p> <p>IE (Comments): The content of the proposed training courses for animal caretakers must to be laid out by the Commission in implementing acts so that the competent authorities can ensure standardisation of these courses throughout the MS.</p> <p>IT (Drafting Suggestions): (a) ensuring that training courses are available for animal caretakers;</p> <p>IT (Comments): We are in favour of a more open wording, to evaluate who to target with the training courses.</p> <p>MT (Comments): Malta would prefer that a minimum content or syllabus is added to the Regulation, possibly as an annex through an Implementing Act.</p> <p>SE (Drafting Suggestions): (a) ensuring that training courses are available for animal caretakers; <u>approving the content of training courses available for animal caretakers.</u></p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>SE (Comments):</p> <p>Training courses are valuable and it is important that they maintain a high level of quality in terms of content. Sweden can see some value in having a competent authority responsible for approving content for such courses (to make sure that they e.g. adhere to legislation). However, actually ensuring that courses exist and are made available should be left in the hand of enterprises and non-profit organizations (such as dog and cat associations). We deem this to be more proportional and cost-effective for the competent authority, and in line with what is the case already where training courses are generally organized by such entities. It is also unclear what the competent authority would be obliged to do to ensure that there are training courses available, with the original provision. For aforementioned reasons, we propose a new (a) and subsequently the removal of (b).</p>
<p>(b) approving the content of the courses referred to in point (a).</p>	<p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>It should be included in the regulation, that the training courses referred to in Article 9 should be approved by the competent authority.</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>Approving that the content of the courses referred to in point (a) shall include courses <u>on animal welfare, handling, evacuation plan on disasters and first aid for dogs and cats</u> .</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>SE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(b) approving the content of the courses referred to in point (a).</p> <p>SE (Comments):</p> <p>See comment above.</p> <p>SK (Comments):</p> <p>SK asks that the unite content of the courses would be set by annex of this regulation.</p> <p>It is also necessary to specify if the course needs to end with an exam.</p>
<i>Article 19</i>	<p>IT (Comments):</p> <p>We agree with the objective of establishing and maintaing interoperable national databases, so that the identification of a dog or a cat can be authenticated and traced across the Union.</p> <p>It is necessary to guarantee that the competent authorities will be able to continue to use national systems, established before the implementing act referred in paragraph 3. In addition, we would like to understand better in what way the interoperability of MS databases is planned to work. Is it through a central system?</p>
	<p>EL (Comments):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<i>The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 23 supplementing this Article to lay down further rules on databases.</i>
<i>Databases of dogs and cats</i>	
<p>1. From [3 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], competent authorities shall establish and maintain a database for the registration of microchipped dogs and cats.</p>	<p>CZ (Drafting Suggestions): From [3 5 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], competent authorities shall establish and maintain a database for the registration of microchipped dogs and cats.</p> <p>CZ (Comments): According to paragraph 1, Member States have 3 years to establish a database for the registration of dogs and cats, according to paragraph 3, the implementing act lay down requirements on the databases will not be published till date of application, what means 2 years after the entry into force of the Regulation, which means that Member States will have only 1 year to set up the database, when the specific requirements will be known.</p> <p>It takes years to create such a database. Moreover, in the Czech Republic there is no obligation to identify and register cats. For these reasons, it would be appropriate to extend the deadline for the establishment of the database to 5 years and 7 years to link the database with other MS.</p> <p>DK (Drafting Suggestions):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>1. From [3 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], competent authorities shall establish and maintain a database for the registration of microchipped dogs and cats <u>marked in accordance with Article 17.</u></p> <p>DK (Comments): It is the most reasonable to have neutral wording not specifying the means of identification</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions): From [3 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], competent authorities shall establish and maintain a <u>national</u> database for the registration of microchipped dogs and cats <u>that shall include also databases for the registration of breeders, pet shops and shelters .</u></p> <p>IE (Comments): Ireland currently does not have a single national database. The microchipping databases available in Ireland are approved by the competent authority but owned and operated by private companies. Officials of the competent authority are entitled to request and obtain data from the private databases as needed.</p> <p>We seek clarification that this proposal would not stop the operation of these private databases, and request that the wording be amended to reflect that.</p> <p>We suggest that, instead of the CA establishing and maintaining a database, that the CA ensure that approved private databases shall make their data available for search tools, interaction with other approved databases, and for any</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>pan-EU database.</p> <p>We propose an overarching database at EU level should be developed. All databases within each MS can feed into this EU database and all MS have access to the data on this EU database.</p> <p>LU (Comments):</p> <p>In the interest of cost reduction there should also be provision for the possibility of setting up a common/shared database between two or more Member States.</p> <p>LV (Comments):</p> <p>We do not object to this requirement, but with regard to the designation of animals, we would point out that the introduction of a requirement for an animal identification number (microchip) indicating the country of origin of the animal should include requirements for those dogs and cats already marked with a microchip whose number does not indicate the country of origin of the animal.</p> <p>SE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>1. From [3 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], competent authorities shall establish and maintain a database for the registration of microchipped dogs and cats <u>identified with an injectable transponder</u>.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>SE (Comments):</p> <p>Sweden is positive to the proposal, but suggests changing ‘microchip’ to ‘injectible transponder’ in order to harmonize the terminology with Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2019/2035. We suggest that this change is made when appropriate throughout the proposal.</p>
<p>2. From [5 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], Member States shall ensure that their databases as referred to in paragraph 1 are interoperable with the same databases of other Member States so that the identification of a dog or a cat can be authenticated and traced across the Union.</p>	<p>AT (Comments):</p> <p>There are already many interoperable Databases that are now put together in Europetnet. The new system should be oriented on Europetnet.</p> <p>BG (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>From [5 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], Member States shall ensure that their databases as referred to in paragraph 1 are interoperable with the same databases of other Member States <u>EU central database established by the Commission</u> so that the identification of a dog or a cat can be authenticated and traced across the Union.</p> <p>BG (Comments):</p> <p>Some Member States use the population database, which is a problem. At the same time, if there are 27 different</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>systems, interoperability must be achieved with each of them. Some Member States already have developed national systems and may need to upgrade. In this regard, we support the idea of creating a central database, which will facilitate the work.</p> <p>CZ (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>From [5 7 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], Member States shall ensure that their databases as referred to in paragraph 1 are interoperable with the same databases of other Member States so that the identification of a dog or a cat can be authenticated and traced across the Union.</p> <p>CZ (Comments):</p> <p>According to paragraph 1, Member States have 3 years to establish a database for the registration of dogs and cats, according to paragraph 3, the implementing act lay down requirements on the databases will not be published till date of application, what means 2 years after the entry into force of the Regulation, which means that Member States will have only 1 year to set up the database, when the specific requirements will be known. It takes years to create such a database. Moreover, in the Czech Republic there is no obligation to identify and register cats. For these reasons, it would be appropriate to extend the deadline for the establishment of the database to 5 years and 7 years to link the database with other MS.</p> <p>DE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>23. <u>By 3 years from the day following that of the publication of the act referred to in paragraph 2 in the</u></p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p><u>Official Journal of the European Union</u> [5 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], Member States shall ensure that their databases as referred to in paragraph 1 are interoperable with the same databases of other Member States so that the identification of a dog or a cat can be authenticated and traced across the Union.</p> <p>DE (Comments):</p> <p>The commission proposal provides for the implementing act within 2 years and interoperability within 5 years of the regulation coming in force. The member states should therefore have at least 3 years to implement the requirements set out in the regulation. The idea of the amendment is to maintain this time interval even if the implementing act is delayed.</p> <p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>Denmark has a reservation regarding the date of entry into force since it is not clear what requirements the Commission will lay down in the implementing acts.</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>From [5 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], Member States shall ensure that their <u>national</u> databases as referred to in paragraph 1 are interoperable with the same <u>national</u> databases of other Member States so that the identification of a dog or a cat can be authenticated and traced across the Union.</p> <p>HR (Comments):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>HR cannot support this proposal. If the Commission intends to establish a database then it makes sense that MSs have to adjust their database to the central one (like IMSOC for example). Otherwise it is very difficult (impossible) to adjust 27 different IT systems to be interoperable.</p> <p>The only data that can be shared between MSs and Commission are data on registered and approved establishments and this can be provided similar as for approved aquaculture establishments under the AHL Reg. 2016/429</p> <p>HU (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>2. From [5 <u>7</u> years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], Member States shall ensure that their databases as referred to in paragraph 1 are interoperable with the same databases of other Member States so that the identification of a dog or a cat can be authenticated and traced across the Union.</p> <p>HU (Comments):</p> <p>Detailed rules of the databases are not known yet in the future act that has to be worked out by the COM. Therefore the planned transition period may not be sufficient. The technical and financial burden to member states also has to be taken into account. Therefore we propose a longer period than five years.</p> <p>IE (Comments):</p> <p>We suggest this be amended such that the requirement to be interoperable also extends to any approved private databases within MS.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>NL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>2. From [<i>5 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation / <u>application as mentioned in point 3</u></i>], Member States shall ensure that their databases as referred to in paragraph 1 are interoperable with the same databases of other Member States so that the identification of a dog or a cat can be authenticated and traced across the Union.</p>
	<p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>3. <u>the possibility to include in every national database a digital booklet of every animal</u></p> <p>EL (Comments):</p> <p>A digital booklet that shall be printed and accompany the passport, can be a proof of the identification and registration of a dog or a cat.</p>
<p>3. By [<i>the date of application</i>], the Commission shall, by means of implementing acts, lay down requirements on the databases as referred to in paragraph 1</p>	<p>BG (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>By [<i>the date of application</i>], the Commission shall, by means of implementing acts, lay down requirements on the databases <u>minimum data uploaded from the national databases to the central database as referred to in paragraph 2</u> concerning:</p> <p>BG</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
concerning:	<p data-bbox="577 268 748 300">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 320 1352 352">We support creating a central database to facilitate the work.</p> <p data-bbox="577 392 622 424">CZ</p> <p data-bbox="577 427 748 459">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 480 2074 847">According to paragraph 1, Member States have 3 years to establish a database for the registration of dogs and cats, according to paragraph 3, the implementing act lay down requirements on the databases will not be published till date of application, what means 2 years after the entry into force of the Regulation, which means that Member States will have only 1 year to set up the database, when the specific requirements will be known. It takes years to create such a database. Moreover, in the Czech Republic there is no obligation to identify and register cats. For these reasons, it would be appropriate to extend the deadline for the establishment of the database to 5 years and 7 years to link the database with other MS.</p> <p data-bbox="577 887 622 919">DE</p> <p data-bbox="577 922 882 954">(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p data-bbox="577 975 2051 1118">23. By [2 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], the date of application, the Commission shall, by means of implementing acts, lay down requirements on the databases as referred to in paragraph 1 concerning:</p> <p data-bbox="577 1158 622 1190">DE</p> <p data-bbox="577 1193 748 1225">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 1246 1155 1278">2 years after entry into force, compare art. 28</p> <p data-bbox="577 1318 622 1350">DK</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p data-bbox="577 268 748 300">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 320 2051 464">In our view, it would be reasonable to make sure that the scope of this provision also includes interoperability with the IMSOC platforms. This might enable a more cohesive system, especially considering the upcoming revision of the regulation on the movement of pets and the rules on passports.</p> <p data-bbox="577 504 622 536">SK</p> <p data-bbox="577 544 748 576">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 592 2078 679">SK considers very important that delegated act setting the requirements for the database is published the earliest possible, so that MSs are able to prepare for it.</p> <p data-bbox="577 703 2078 1015">Slovakia has an established database since 2003 for registering animals with data on owners, address where the keeping of the animal takes place, and also a registration of pet passports is included. It's a huge system that SK permanently modifies. The database has several levels for different users, e.g. official veterinarian-for the purpose of an inspections, private veterinarian-for the purpose (obligation) of recording data on animals (microchipping, rabies vaccination, change of ownership...), distributors of microchips and passports- allocation of passports to individual private veterinarians,...</p> <p data-bbox="577 1038 1957 1126">SK wants to emphasize that it will not be easy to incorporate any changes into such a complex system and a significant amount of time would be necessary for it.</p>
(a) their content;	<p data-bbox="577 1254 622 1286">DK</p> <p data-bbox="577 1294 882 1326">(Drafting Suggestions):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(a) their content, <u>which shall at least include</u>;</p> <p><u>(i) The identification information of the animal</u></p> <p><u>(ii) The identification of the current responsible person registered in accordance with Article 17</u></p> <p><u>(iii) Every person previously registered as responsible for the animal in accordance with Article 17</u></p> <p><u>(iv) The identification of the veterinarian responsible for marking the animal.</u></p> <p>EE (Comments): If the content includes personal data, it should be regulated by the regulation not the implementing act ((EU) 2018/1725 article 5 point 2)</p> <p>SE (Comments): Sweden suggests that the content shall include information on the breeding establishment or owner, the parent animals identification when possible, the dog's or cat's identification number, sex, date of birth and country of birth. We also suggest using s system like VeriPet – the Technical Solution to Stop Illegal Puppy Traders in order to double-verify the information.</p>
(b) their interoperability between Member States;	<p>BG (Drafting Suggestions): their interoperability between Member States;</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>HR (Drafting Suggestions): (b) — their interoperability between Member States;</p> <p>HR (Comments): HR is very concerend that request for interoperability between MSs would put big administrative and financial burdent of MSs that already have national data bases established</p>
(c) their functionality for providing proof of the identification and registration of a dog or a cat, as referred to in article 17 (3) point (a).	<p>CZ (Comments): We have concerns about providing chip numbers to potential purchasers of animals. Chip numbers should not be available to the public on online platforms to prevent misuse and falsification. We would also like to know if there is a feasibility and functionality study of this system?</p> <p>HR (Drafting Suggestions): (c) — their functionality for providing proof of the identification and registration of a dog or a cat, as referred to in article 17 (3) point (a).</p>
(d) the registry where	BG

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<p>Member States will declare their databases, and the necessary parameters for connecting those databases with one another according to the provisions established under point (b);</p>	<p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>the registry where Member States will declare their databases, and the necessary parameters for connecting those databases with one another according to the provisions established under point (b);</p> <p>DE</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(d) atthe registry where Member States will declare their databases, and the necessary parameters for connecting those databases with one another according to the provisions established under point (b);</p> <p>DE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>We have added this change, because this is the first time the registry is mentioned.</p> <p>HR</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(d) the registry where Member States will declare their databases, and the necessary parameters for connecting those databases with one another according to the provisions established under point (b);</p>
<p>(e) the access to be given to the system referred to in Article 17(6) for the purpose of confirming the authenticity</p>	<p>EE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>We assume, it is not possible outside of the EU for some local veterinarian to access some EU national database to identify and register the animal. Maybe it should be mandatory for all national databases to implement such a protective measure to prevent the fraud. Without this measure, veterinarians outside the EU can register the animal into some national database and the traceability of the animals origin is not possible. Entering of the dog or cat first</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
of the identification and registration of the dogs and cats;	time into EU should be always with the microchip not originated from EU.
(f) provisions on data protection pursuant to the requirements of Regulation (EU) 2018/1725 and Regulation (EU) 2016/679.	
Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 24.	
<i>Article 20</i>	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<i>Collection of data on animal welfare and reporting</i>	
<p>1. The competent authorities shall collect, analyse and publish the data set out in Annex III:</p>	<p>BG (Drafting Suggestions): The competent authorities shall collect, analyse and publish <u>report to the Commission the</u> data set out in Annex III:</p> <p>BG (Comments): Where will the competent authorities publish the data? If it is published in 24 different languages, it will be useless.</p> <p>DE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. The competent authorities shall collect, analyse and publish the data set out in Annex III.;</p> <p>DE (Comments): Editorial</p> <p>HU (Drafting Suggestions): The competent authorities shall collect, analyse and publish the data set out in Annex III:</p> <p>HU</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(Comments):</p> <p>In our opinion, the type of data referred to in Annex III is not relevant from analysis point of view. However, those data are used for planning of official controls by the competent authorities in accordance with the OCR.</p>
<p>2. The competent authorities shall draw up and transmit to the Commission a report, on machine readable form, on the data referred to in paragraph 1, by 31 August every 3 years from [6 years from the date of entry into force], summarising the data gathered the previous year.</p>	<p>AT</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>2. The competent authorities shall draw up and transmit to the Commission a report, on machine readable form, on the data referred to in paragraph 1, by 31 August every 3 years from [6 years from the date of entry into force], summarising the data gathered the previous <u>years</u></p> <p>AT</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>The data should be reported every 3 years covering the last 3 years</p> <p>BG</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>The competent authorities shall draw up and transmit to the Commission a report, on digital machine-readable form, on the data referred to in paragraph 1, by 31 August every 3 years from [6 years from the date of entry into force], summarising the data gathered the previous <u>3 calendar years</u> year.</p> <p>BG</p> <p>(Comments):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>Proposal to replace "machine readable" with "digital" and correction of a technical error.</p> <p>DE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>2. The competent authorities shall draw up and transmit to the Commission a report, on machine readable form, on the data referred to in paragraph 1, by 31 August every 3 years from [6 years from the date of entry into force], summarising the data gathered the previous <u>3</u> years.</p> <p>DE (Comments):</p> <p>Editorial, this was already discussed at the last working party.</p> <p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>It seems that the requirement for transmission of the report from member states (3 years + 6 years) to the Commission is not coordinated with the requirements in Article 26 paragraph 1, where the Commission shall draft a report by 7 years.</p> <p>EE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>2. The competent authorities shall draw up and transmit to the Commission a report, on machine readable form, on the data referred to in paragraph 1, by 31 August every 3 years from [<i>6 years from the date of entry into force</i>], summarising the data gathered the previous 3 years.</p> <p>HR</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p data-bbox="577 268 748 300">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 320 2056 464">In case there would be a new intreoperable data base as laied down in art 19.2., this provision would put an unnecessary administrative bureden to national CA, as it would be possible to extract all necessary data for each MS individually.</p> <p data-bbox="577 504 629 536">HU</p> <p data-bbox="577 544 748 576">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 596 2040 740">We suggest a yearly report instead of every three years, taking into account the amount of data required. As these data have to be published by member states, therefore these are available. The « machine readability » also have to be clarified.</p> <p data-bbox="577 780 613 812">IE</p> <p data-bbox="577 820 748 852">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 873 2033 1016">Clarification is required here. The data is transmitted in a report to the Commission every 3 years but is only summarising the number of dogs and cats microchipped in the previous year and also the number of dog breeding establishments approved in the previous year. Is this interpretation correct?</p> <p data-bbox="577 1056 629 1088">LU</p> <p data-bbox="577 1096 882 1128">(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p data-bbox="577 1149 2078 1292">The competent authorities shall draw up and transmit to the Commission a report, on machine readable form, on the data referred to in paragraph 1, by 31 August every 3 years from [<i>6 years from the date of entry into force</i>], summarising the data gathered the previous <u>3</u> years, <u>after the last report.</u></p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>LU (Comments): Incoherence between the timeframes: report every three years of the date gathered over a year.</p> <p>NL (Drafting Suggestions): 2. The competent authorities shall draw up and transmit to the Commission a report, on machine readable form, on the data referred to in paragraph 1, by 31 August every 3 years from [<i>6 years from the date of entry into force</i>], summarising the data gathered the previous <u>3</u> years.</p>
<p>3. The Commission may, by means of implementing acts, establish a harmonised methodology for collecting the data referred to in paragraph 1 and establish the template for the report referred to in paragraph 2. Those</p>	<p>HU (Comments): We propose to use the format of the template under the MANCP for this purpose for easier implementation.</p> <p>IE (Drafting Suggestions): 3. The Commission may shall, by means of implementing acts, establish a harmonised methodology for collecting the data referred to in paragraph 1 and establish the template for the report referred to in paragraph 2. Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 24.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 24.	SK (Comments): It is important to define data collection in more details <u>directly in this Regulation</u> (how often to collect data, data content, format,...).
CHAPTER V ENTRY OF DOGS AND CATS INTO THE UNION	HR (Comments): Rules/provisions related to entry into the EU have to be connected with rules/provisions regulated by the AHL Reg. 2016/429 (including its delegated and implementing regulations).
<i>Article 21</i>	BG (Comments): The scope of this Regulation (Article 2) covers only economic activity. The non-commercial movement of pets should not be covered.
<i>Entry of dogs and cats into the Union</i>	BG (Comments): The scope of this Regulation (Article 2) covers only economic activity. The non-commercial movement of pets

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>should not be covered.</p> <p>DE (Drafting Suggestions): <i>Entry of dogs and cats into the Union</i></p> <p>DE (Comments): We maintain our scrutiny reservation because of concerns regarding compatibility with WTO rules, something that is neither explicitly addressed in the proposal's explanatory memorandum nor in its recitals. We await the comments on WTO compatibility by the Council Legal Service as announced in the working party.</p> <p>EL (Comments): Chipping and registration of dogs and cats entering Union shall be mandatory in the country of origin. All animals entering into the Union shall be registered prior to their movement or at the entering point and before entry the member state of destination.</p>
<p>1. From [5 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], dogs and cats may only be entered into the</p>	<p>BG (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>1. From [5 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], dogs and cats, <u>intended for placing on the Union market or supply</u> may only be entered into the Union for placing on the Union market if they have been</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<p>Union for placing on the Union market if they have been kept in compliance with any of the following:</p>	<p><u>bred</u> and kept in compliance with any of the following:</p> <p>DK (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>1. From [5 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], dogs and cats may only be entered into the Union for placing on the Union market if they have been <u>born and kept or, when dispatched from shelters, kept for 30 days before dispatch</u>, in compliance with any of the following:</p> <p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>In our view, this provision does not require the necessary guarantees for ensuring compliance. It should be specified that animals subject to entry have been kept since birth or at least for a given period (could be 30 days) until entry into an approved establishment</p> <p>EE (Comments):</p> <p>All cats and dogs, not registered in some EU national database before arriving to EU can be defined as „placed on the EU market“ with some exemptions.</p> <p>The exceptions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) natural person is moving with their pet(s) or legal person with their kept animal(s). They proof their plan to live in EU for certain amount of time (for example foreign students, workers, refugees) b) traveling with pets or transit - proof of the plan to leave the EU with their pets in certain timeframe (3 months for example). <p>Without defining clearly entering the cats and dogs with the aim to be placed on the market, all entering animals are</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p data-bbox="577 268 987 300">pets travelling with their owner.</p> <p data-bbox="577 339 622 371">LV</p> <p data-bbox="577 376 748 408">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 429 2080 756">In order to ensure that only animals kept and bred in accordance with the welfare requirements laid down in this Article enter the Union market from third countries, it is also necessary to ensure the traceability of dogs and cats entering the Union for non-commercial purposes (travel) from third countries (Regulation (EU) No 576/2013 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 June 2013 on the non-commercial movement of pet animals and repealing Regulation (EC) No 998/2003). This is necessary to ensure that the owner who has entered the Union with a dog or cat also leaves with that animal. If traceability is not ensured for those animals, it is not possible to verify that those animals have not been imported for the purpose of their sale, and consequently it is not possible to ensure that only animals kept and reared in accordance with the welfare requirements laid down in this Article are placed on the Union market.</p> <p data-bbox="577 761 2080 833">Latvia's proposal to establish a database within the Union in which information on dogs and cats entering with the owner from third countries would be entered by the competent authorities deployed at Union border crossing points.</p> <p data-bbox="577 853 622 885">SE</p> <p data-bbox="577 890 882 922">(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p data-bbox="577 943 2080 1031">1. From [35 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], dogs and cats may only be entered into the Union for placing on the Union market if they have been kept in compliance with any of the following:</p> <p data-bbox="577 1067 622 1099">SE</p> <p data-bbox="577 1104 748 1136">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 1157 1991 1244">Sweden suggests that the transitional provisions for entry into the Union shall be the same as within the Union (Article 17).</p> <p data-bbox="577 1342 611 1374">SI</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(Comments):</p> <p><i>Clarification needed:</i></p> <p>How the compliance with the Regulation will be controled in TC?</p>
(a) Chapters II of this Regulation;	
(b) conditions recognised by the Union to be equivalent to those set out by this Regulation; or	<p>AT</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>How should this be implemented? Which kind of evidence existes for equivalent conditions?</p> <p>Are there plans to establish a controll- and recognition procedure?</p>
(c) where applicable, requirements contained in a specific agreement between the Union and the exporting country.	<p>BG</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>where applicable, requirements contained in a specific agreement between the Union and the exporting country</p> <p><u>without prejudice to this Regulation.</u></p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<p>2. From [5 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], dogs and cats may only be entered into the Union for placing on the market or supply provided that they come from a third country or territory and an establishment listed in accordance with Articles 126 and 127 of Regulation (EU) 2017/625.</p>	<p>BG (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>From [5 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], dogs and cats may only be-entered into the Union for placing on the market-or supply provided that they come from: a third country or territory and an establishment listed in accordance with Articles 126 and 127 of Regulation (EU) 2017/625.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <u>an authorised third country or territory listed in a single list established in accordance with article 127 (2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/625 and article 230 (1) of Regulation (EU) 2016/429.</u> <u>and</u> - <u>an approved or registered by the competent authority of the authorised third country establishment listed in accordance with Articles 127 (3) (e) ii) and iii) of Regulation (EU) 2017/625</u> <p>BG (Comments):</p> <p>A list based on Art. 230(1) of R. 206/429 already exists. We believe it would be better to combine the lists into one list for AHL and AW. Therefore we propose the list be a single one, and if the country is on the list, then it meets all requirements.</p> <p>The requirement for the establishment cannot be met in the case of an out-of-the-scope establishment. This requirement should be derogated in a such case.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>According to article 126 (2) of the OCR the requirement that consignments of certain animals from third countries be dispatched from establishments which comply with the relevant requirements must be adopted by the COM by means of <u>delegated acts</u> and shall identify animals by referring to their codes from the Combined Nomenclature.</p> <p>CZ (Comments):</p> <p>It is not clear how it will be ensured that dogs and cats coming from listed establishments comply with the equivalent breeding conditions as set out in Chapter II. Who and how will the listed establishments be approved?</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>From [5 years from date of entry into force of this Regulation], dogs and cats may only be entered into the Union for placing on the market or supply provided that they come from a third country or territory and an establishment listed in accordance with Articles 126 and 127 of Regulation (EU) 2017/625, <u>or a foster household</u></p>
<p>3. From [<i>date of entry into force of this Regulation</i> + 5 years], the official certificate accompanying dogs and cats entering into the Union from third countries and territories</p>	<p>AT (Comments):</p> <p>See the comment above on 1. (b).</p> <p>BG (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>From [<i>date of entry into force of this Regulation</i> + 5 years], the official certificate <u>animal health certificate</u></p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<p>shall contain an attestation certifying compliance with paragraphs 1 and confirming that the dogs and cats originate from an establishment listed in accordance with paragraph 2.</p>	<p>accompanying dogs and cats entering into the Union from third countries and territories <u>for placing on the market or supply</u> shall contain an attestation certifying compliance with paragraphs 1 and confirming that the dogs and cats originate from an establishment listed in accordance with paragraph 2 <u>or it is out of the scope of this Regulation in accordance with article 4 of [number of this Regulation]</u></p> <p>BG (Comments):</p> <p>The live animals are accompanied by an animal health certificate.</p> <p>In addition, it should be possible to declare the exceptions for the cases which this regulation does not apply to.</p> <p>DK (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>3. From [<i>date of entry into force of this Regulation</i> + 5 years], the <u>animal health certificate</u> official certificate accompanying dogs and cats entering into the Union from third countries and territories shall contain an attestation certifying compliance with paragraphs 1 and confirming that the dogs and cats originate from an establishment listed in accordance with paragraph 2.</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>From [date of entry into force of this Regulation + 5 years], the official certificate accompanying dogs and cats entering into the Union from third countries and territories shall contain an attestation certifying compliance with paragraphs 1 and confirming that the dogs and cats originate from an establishment listed in accordance with paragraph 2, <u>or a foster household</u></p> <p>HR (Comments):</p> <p>Is this a separate document? This should be inserted in the certificate already provided by the AHL legislation.</p>
<p>4. Without prejudice to Article 10(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) No 576/2013 and Article 74(1) of Regulation (EU) 2020/692¹, dogs and cats entering into the Union shall</p>	<p>BG (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>Without prejudice to Article 10(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) No 576/2013 and Article 74(1) of Regulation (EU) 2020/692², dogs and cats entering into the Union <u>for placing on the market or supply</u> shall be identified with a microchip as referred to in Article 17(1) and allowing for traceability <u>or accompanied by proof that they were microchipped before [date of entry into force of this Regulation].</u></p> <p>BG</p>

¹ Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/692 of 30 January 2020 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/429 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards rules for entry into the Union, and the movement and handling after entry of consignments of certain animals, germinal products and products of animal origin, OJ L 174, 3.6.2020, p. 379.

² Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2020/692 of 30 January 2020 supplementing Regulation (EU) 2016/429 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards rules for entry into the Union, and the movement and handling after entry of consignments of certain animals, germinal products and products of animal origin, OJ L 174, 3.6.2020, p. 379.

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<p>be identified with a microchip as referred to in Article 17(1) and allowing for traceability.</p>	<p>(Comments):</p> <p>We believe that this regulation covers only economic activities and only applies to commercial consignments. It is better if the requirements for non-commercial movements of pets, to combat illegal traffic, be addressed in the Regulation on the non-commercial movement of pets, which will be revised soon. In addition, further discussion is needed on real situations, different competent authorities in MSs., obligations for operators (airlines, airport authority, railways, tourist operators, cruising ships, etc.)</p> <p>In general, we strongly support the idea, but it must be addressed in the revision of Regulation 576/2013. We think that proposing it in this way would be practically impossible and will not achieve the goal.</p> <p>DK (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>4. Without prejudice to Article <u>249(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) No 2016/429</u> 10(1)(a) of Regulation (EU) No 576/2013 and Article 74(1) of Regulation (EU) 2020/692¹, dogs and cats entering into the Union shall be identified with a microchip as referred to in Article 17(1) and allowing for traceability.</p> <p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>Regulation 576/2013 will cease to apply on April 21st, 2026, which is probably before this proposed regulation will come to apply. Therefore, a reference to the Animal Health law, which shall apply from April 2026 onward, seems more correct</p> <p>LV (Comments):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>The deadline laid down of Article 21(4) for the registration of dogs and cats imported from third countries in the Member State database ‘within 48 hours’ is insufficient. It would be necessary to have longer deadline or replace “48 hours” by a number of working days (e.g. if an animal enters an EU Member State on Friday evening, registration with a practising veterinarian is not possible during the holidays).</p>
<p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48 hours of arrival.</p>	<p>AT (Comments): 48 hours seems to be a very short period and should be extended. We suggest that the supplier is obliged to pre-register the animal before entering the Union and finally be registered by the owner or responsible person.</p> <p>BG (Drafting Suggestions): In case the dogs or Dogs and cats entering into the Union <u>for placing on the market or supply</u> are not yet <u>shall be registered</u> in a Member State <u>the EU central</u> database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48 hours of arrival. <u>via the TRACES system according to the information provided in the validated CHEDA.</u></p> <p>BG (Comments): All necessary data will be available in TRACES. Double entry of the same data should be avoided. We propose a link between TRACES and the central database.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>If the proposal for registering animals born in the EU with a link to the mother's microchip, is accepted, this requirement cannot apply to animals which come from third countries.</p> <p>CZ (Comments):</p> <p>We consider the registration of the animal in the national database within 48 hours after the arrival of the dog/cat at their place of destination to be too short. A more appropriate time limit would be 5 -7 days. We also consider it appropriate to state the time limit in days, not hours, and to indicate that these are working days.</p> <p>We propose that the animal should be registered at the point of entry into the EU by the customs administration. This will ensure better traceability of the animals. If the animal does not travel with the owner, the consignor of the animal would also be entered into the system and the owner would ensure that the register is changed when the animal arrives at the place of destination.</p> <p>DE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats, <u>except service dogs from customs, police and military</u>, entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within <u>2 working days</u> 48 hours of arrival.</p> <p>DE (Comments):</p> <p>We want to rule out the possibility of the registration of service dogs from customs, police and the military in a</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>Member State database allowing conclusions to be drawn about the capabilities of official institutions (especially in the event of unauthorised access to the data).</p> <p>48 hours might be too short if a weekend falls within this period.</p> <p>DK (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 72 hours 48 hours of arrival.</p> <p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>48 hours is an unrealistic short time to register a dog or cat. Especially when it is a requirement that a veterinarian must register the animals. We suggest 72 hours, but are open to discuss.</p> <p>EE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination according to TRACES, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48 72 hours of arrival.</p> <p>EE (Comments):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>It harmonizes the aim of the article with the proposal on the protection of animals during transport and related operations. Transportation of cats and dogs placed on the market is under the scope of the proposal, so the movement can be controlled in the TRACES. Other means to define the time of arrival is by the information on the health certificate. It is in force only 10 days, the registrations should not take place later than 5 (or 6) days after expiration. Long journey could not take more time than 3 days+ time for identification by the vet.</p> <p>72 hours is necessary because of weekends.</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48 hours of arrival. <u>All animals entering into the Union shall be registered prior to their movement or at the entering point.</u></p> <p>FI (Comments):</p> <p>In our view the owner or person responsible for the animal should be able to register the animal. In this case registration could be required within 48 hours of arrival at the place of destination.</p> <p>FR (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48 hours 7 days of arrival. <u>This should apply to all dogs or cats staying in the Union for at least 3 months.</u></p> <p>FR (Comments):</p> <p>France wishes to extend the registration deadline from 2 to 7 days to better align with practical realities. Additionally, all animals entering the Union and staying for at least 3 months, including for purposes other than commercial exchanges, should be registered. Only tourists passing through for less than 3 months should be exempt from the registration obligation.</p> <p>Furthermore, it seems to us that the information to be collected when these dogs and cats are registered in one of the Member States' databases will have to be sufficiently precise to ensure proper traceability of the animals. An update of this data will also have to be planned. For example, the animal's holding address will need to be provided and updated in the event that the animal is registered in the Member State through which it entered the EU and then changes its Member State (e.g.: the animal enters EU country X, is registered there, but then comes to live in EU country Y).</p> <p>HR (Comments):</p> <p>What is the reasoning for this rule? If dog or cat is intended to a certain place of destination, registration has to be there.</p> <p>HU</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p data-bbox="577 264 882 300">(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p data-bbox="577 317 2029 518">In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall <u>request</u> ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases. <u>This registration must be completed</u> within 4 8 days hours of arrival.</p> <p data-bbox="577 555 627 587">HU</p> <p data-bbox="577 592 748 627">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 644 2018 791">Taking into account that travels can occur also on bank holidays or weekends when the availability of veterinary services can be limited, we propose 8 days instead of 48 hours. Besides, the animal owner has no access to the national database, therefore he/she can only request the registration of the animal instead of ensuring it.</p> <p data-bbox="577 828 611 860">IE</p> <p data-bbox="577 865 748 900">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 917 2049 1118">Propose that 48 hours is extended to 5 days to allow owners/person responsible for the animal time to register the animal onto a MS database. If dog owners are moving to the EU from 3rd countries and bringing their animals with them they will be under logistical/administrative pressure with moving countries and this should be taken into account and sufficient time given to do this registration.</p> <p data-bbox="577 1197 2054 1343">It was mentioned at the council WP meeting on the 21st February 2024 that perhaps this microchip registration on a database could take place at the border control post of entry into the EU. Our concern with this option is that the owner does not accompany a commercial dog to the BCP for inspection and therefore the owner is not present to</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>give consent to their data being shared and also this puts the administrative burden onto the competent authority BCP officials. In Ireland we see a lot of pets travelling through the BCPs as commercial dogs and cats and this is only because the owner does not travel within 5 days of the pet. Also as mentioned by other MS not every border has veterinary officials working there and therefore collaboration with Customs officials would be required.</p> <p>LT (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48-72 hours of arrival from the moment of crossing the EU border, with time being recorded in the TRACES NT system.</p> <p>LT (Comments):</p> <p>A 48-hour window might be insufficient, especially considering the challenge of accurately assessing arrival times at the destination. Hence, we propose extending the timeframe to a minimum of 72 hours from the moment of crossing the EU border, with time being recorded in the TRACES NT system.</p> <p>MT (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48-72 hours of arrival.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>MT (Comments):</p> <p>Malta would prefer 72 hours instead of 48 hours as this would allow for better implementation and give flexibility to the Competent Authority.</p> <p>NL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), [once they arrive at their place of destination,] the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48 hours X working days of [arrival] <u>/entering into the Union</u>.</p> <p><u>When registering the dog or cat</u> (from a third country in the database of an EU Member State), <u>the third country of origin shall also be registered</u>.</p> <p>NL (Comments):</p> <p>And as a further improvement we may be also could – in order to avoid unregistered/untraceable change of</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>ownership/responsibility – create an obligation that at entering into the Union the owner or person responsible for the animal shall directly make a <i>preliminary</i> registration of the animal, so that the animal and the owner or person responsible for the animal remain traceable until the registration by the veterinarian (or the assistant under responsibility of the vet) in the national database referred to in article 19.</p> <p>PL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p><u>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at the veterinary border control post, the owner or person responsible for the animal or the operator responsible for the consignment shall ensure their registration into the Member State’s database in order to entry into the EU.</u></p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination <u>in another Member State</u>, the owner or person responsible for the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member State’s databases within <u>two working days</u> 48 hours of arrival.</p> <p>PL (Comments):</p> <p>It is understood that before registering the animal in a database of an MS the animal is unidentifiable, save from the microchip and data from border veterinary control posts.</p> <p>Perhaps in order to minimise fraud and to improve traceability we may require the seller/supplier or operator</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>responsible for the consignment (mentioned in art. 56 of regulation 2017/625) when entering the EU at the veterinary control post to register the animal entering the EU and not yet registered in a MS database in the database of the country whose border he is passing. This way the animal would be identifiable since crossing the border, i.e. when lost after entering EU but before reaching destination it would be possible to identify the person responsible for the animal.</p> <p>The databases of the different MS would need to be interoperable in the scope of transferring information about current person responsible for the animal (after selling/supplying) – meaning that one animal would be at a given time registered in one database in one country. In this example the seller passing EU border in country A would register in database of country A and after a few days when reaching destination and transferring ownership in country B the owner in country B would register the animal in database of country B and the animal would automatically ‘disappear’ from database in country A.</p> <p>SE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the animal dog or cat shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 4872 hours of arrival.</p> <p>SE (Comments):</p> <p>Sweden suggests this revision to minimise potential issues with dogs or cats arriving during weekends and having difficulties getting the registration done in time. The change from ‘animal’ to ‘dog or cat’ is made to reflect the same</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>change in other parts of the proposal.</p> <p>SI (Comments):</p> <p><i>Clarification needed:</i></p> <p>Is the registration obligatory for all dogs and cats entering EU? If non-commercial movements are not included, do dogs and cats bought/obtained in TC (stray dogs or “purebreds”) then moved to EU as pets, accompanying “owner”, and then sold or given away, ought to be registered or not? This is a common way of NVOs to import strays from Balkan to EU, and then offered through platforms for adoption. Movements are masked as non commercial movements fro TCs.</p> <p>How the person responsible for the animal shall decide into which MS database will register animals? Would that be linked to the territory/ address of the operator/supplier, or a place of selling animals?</p> <p>SK (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>In case the dogs or cats entering into the Union are not yet registered in a Member State database as referred to in Article 19(1), once they arrive at their place of destination, the owner or person responsible for the import of the animal shall ensure their registration into one of the Member States databases within 48 hours 4 days of arrival.</p> <p>SK (Comments):</p> <p>SK proposes to extend the period for mandatory registration of animals in the database, due to possible complications during weekends and holidays and the working hours of private veterinarians (who in SK carry out</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>animal registration).</p> <p>SK suggests adding the part "the person responsible for the import of the animal" to ensure that the registration obligation will be on the importer of the animal as the first owner within the EU, and not on any other owner possibly changed within the set period of mandatory registration, in order to ensure full traceability in the register.</p> <p>SK considers appropriate if, upon entering the EU, the importer was informed about the obligation to register the animal in the EU database and received appropriate information as to where and by when it should be done.</p>
<p>5. The Commission is empowered, by means of implementing acts, to establish a procedure for the recognition by the Union of equivalent conditions under point paragraph 1 point (b). Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure</p>	<p>DE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>5. The Commission is empowered, by means of implementing acts, to establish a procedure for the recognition by the Union of equivalent conditions under point paragraph 1 point (b). Those implementing acts shall be adopted in accordance with the examination procedure referred to in Article 24.</p> <p>DE (Comments):</p> <p>Editorial</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
referred to in Article 24.	
CHAPTER VI PROCEDURAL PROVISIONS	
<i>Article 22</i>	HR (Comments): It is difficult to comment art. 22 as revised Ann I is not available.
<i>Amendment to the Annexes</i>	
The Commission is empowered to adopt delegated acts in accordance with Article 23 amending the Annexes to this Regulation to take into	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
account of scientific and technical progress, including, when relevant, scientific opinions of EFSA, and of social, economic and environmental impacts, as regards:	
(a) feeding frequencies and weaning process;	<p>DK (Drafting Suggestions): (a) feeding frequencies and weaning process;</p> <p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>Denmark has previously stated that it should not be a specific requirement in the regulation. As previously stated, Denmark suggests that the feeding requirements of 1.1.a-c and 1.2 should be deleted, so that instead of minimum requirements stating that feeding frequency should be in accordance with their nutritional needs, in accordance with their physiological state, eg. Pregnancy, infancy, etc. Their needs are very individual and the frequency of feeding is</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>difficult to control.</p> <p>Denmark finds that article 5 a) (of the commission's proposal) covers this and should not be further specified since the needs depend on the individual animal.</p>
(b) temperature ranges;	<p>DK (Drafting Suggestions): (b) — temperature ranges;</p> <p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>Denmark has previously stated that it should not be a general requirement in the regulation.</p> <p>As previously stated, temperature requirements could be rephrased to “Temperature ranges shall be adapted accordingly to the dog’s or cat’s physiological needs” instead of the detailed interval in 2.1.a-d. When the operator already has to take coating etc. into consideration, the intervals can be seen more as a guideline.</p> <p>Denmark finds that article 5 b) (of the commission's proposal) covers this and should not be further specified since the needs depend on the individual animal.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(c) lighting parameters;	DK (Drafting Suggestions): (c) lighting parameters;
(d) kennel and cattery design;	
(e) feeding and watering equipment design;	
(f) space allowances for different categories of dogs and cats;	
(g) frequency of pregnancies;	ES (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	(g) frequency and maximum number of pregnancies;
(h) minimum age of bitches and queens for onset of breeding;	<p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(h) minimum age of bitches and queens for onset of breeding. <u>After two cesarian sections breeding shall be forbidden</u></p> <p>SE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(h) minimum and maximum age of bitches and queens <u>used for</u> onset of breeding;</p> <p>SE (Comments):</p> <p>Sweden suggests adding maximum age since this is equally important for the animals welfare.</p>
(i) socialisation, enrichment and other measures for meeting behavioural needs of dogs and cats;	<p>FR (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(i) socialisation <u>inter- and intraspecific relations</u>, enrichment and other measures for meeting behavioural needs of dogs and cats;</p> <p>FR (Comments):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	For information, in the scientific community, “socialise” is used for intraspecific relations and “familiarise” is used for interspecific relations.
(j) requirements for transponders used to mark dogs and cats;	
(k) data to be collected for policy monitoring and evaluation.	
	<p>NL (Drafting Suggestions): <u>(l) air quality;</u> <u>(m) minimum ratio of the number of animal caretakers to the number of animals;</u> <u>(n) housing requirements so that cats and dogs can exhibit natural and species-specific behaviour.</u></p> <p>SE (Drafting Suggestions): <u>(l) ranges for air circulation, dust levels, relative air humidity, gas concentrations and ventilation.</u></p> <p>SE</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(Comments):</p> <p>Sweden suggests adding these parameters since Article 12 (c) only states “limits which are not harmful for dogs and cats”. These parameters are equally important for the welfare of the dogs and cats. We expect more research in these areas and think it is important for the Commission to be empowered to adopt delegated acts regarding these subjects as well.</p>
<p>Any additions of requirements in the Annexes shall be based on updated scientific or technical evidence, in particular regarding the specific conditions needed to ensure the welfare of the dogs and cats covered by the scope of this Regulation. Where relevant, those delegated acts shall provide for sufficient transition periods to allow for operators impacted to adapt to the new requirements.</p>	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<i>Article 23</i>	
<i>Exercise of the delegation</i>	
1. The power to adopt delegated acts is conferred on the Commission subject to the conditions laid down in this Article.	
2. The power to adopt delegated acts referred to in Article 6(4), Article 10(2) and Article 22 shall be conferred on the Commission for an	<p>CZ (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>The power to adopt delegated acts referred to in Article 6(4), Article 10(2) and Article 22 shall be conferred on the Commission for an indeterminate period of time for a period of five years from [<i>the date of entry into force of this Regulation</i>]. The Commission shall draw up a report in respect of the delegation of power not later than</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
indeterminate period of time from [<i>the date of entry into force of this Regulation</i>].	<p>nine months before the end of the five-year period. The delegation of power shall be tacitly extended for periods of an identical duration, unless the European Parliament or the Council opposes such extension not later than three months before the end of each period.</p> <p>CZ (Comments): The provisions should be the same as in other regulations.</p>
<p>3. The delegation of power referred to in Article 6(4), Article 10(2) and Article 22 may be revoked at any time by the European Parliament or by the Council. A decision to revoke shall put an end to the delegation of the power specified in that decision. It shall take effect the day following the publication of the decision in <i>the Official</i></p>	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<p><i>Journal of the European Union</i> or at a later date specified therein. It shall not affect the validity of any delegated acts already in force.</p>	
<p>4. Before adopting a delegated act, the Commission shall consult experts designated by each Member State in accordance with the principles laid down in the Interinstitutional Agreement of 13 April 2016 on Better Law-Making.</p>	
<p>5. As soon as it adopts a delegated act, the Commission</p>	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
shall notify it simultaneously to the European Parliament and to the Council.	
<p>6. A delegated act adopted pursuant to Article 6(4), Article 10(2) and Article 22 shall enter into force only if no objection has been expressed either by the European Parliament or by the Council within a period of two months of notification of that act to the European Parliament and the Council or if, before the expiry of that period, the European Parliament and the Council have both informed the Commission that they will not</p>	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
object. That period shall be extended by two months at the initiative of the European Parliament or of the Council.	
<i>Article 24</i>	
<i>Committee procedure</i>	
1. The Commission shall be assisted by the Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed established by Article 58(1) of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002. That Committee shall be a committee within the meaning	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
of Regulation (EU) No 182/2011.	
2. Where reference is made to this paragraph, Article 5 of Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 shall apply.	
Where the Committee delivers no opinion, the Commission shall not adopt the draft implementing act and Article 5(4), third subparagraph, of Regulation (EU) No 182/2011 shall apply.	
CHAPTER VI STRICTER NATIONAL	HU (Drafting Suggestions):

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
MEASURES AND FINAL PROVISIONS	CHAPTER VI VII STRICTER NATIONAL MEASURES AND FINAL PROVISIONS
<i>Article 25</i>	
<i>Stricter national measures</i>	
1. This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from maintaining any stricter national rules aimed at a more extensive protection of the welfare of dogs and cats and in force at the time of entry into force of this Regulation, provided that those rules are not inconsistent with this	<p>AT (Comments): The wording: “those rules are not inconsistent with this Regulation” should be defined in detail.</p> <p>DE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from maintaining any stricter national rules aimed at a more extensive protection of the welfare of dogs and cats and in force at the time of entry into force of this Regulation, provided that those rules are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market. Before [the date of application of this Regulation], Member States shall inform the Commission about such national rules. The Commission shall bring them to the attention of the other Member States.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<p>Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market. Before <i>[the date of application of this Regulation]</i>, Member States shall inform the Commission about such national rules. The Commission shall bring them to the attention of the other Member States.</p>	<p>DE (Comments): This addition would be a novelty in European animal welfare regulations (see Art. 1 Abs. 3 VO 1/2005 and Art. 26 VO 1099/2009). If it is a repetition of treaty content or other EU regulations, there is no need for such duplication. An unnecessarily strong restriction of the sovereignty of the member states in the area of animal welfare, for which the EU has no original competence, must be avoided.</p> <p>DK (Drafting Suggestions): 1. This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from maintaining any stricter national rules aimed at a more extensive protection of the welfare of <u>or traceability of</u> dogs and cats and in force at the time of entry into force of this Regulation, provided that those rules are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market. Before <i>[the date of application of this Regulation]</i>, Member States shall inform the Commission about such national rules. The Commission shall bring them to the attention of the other Member States.</p> <p>DK (Comments): Directive (EU) 2015/1535 already sets procedures for notification of national legislation having possible effects on the internal market. Thus, there seems to be no need for this parallel obligation.</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>1. This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from maintaining any stricter national rules aimed at a more extensive protection of the welfare of dogs and cats and in force at the time of entry into force of this Regulation, provided that those rules are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market. Before [the date of application of this Regulation], Member States shall inform the Commission about such national rules. The Commission shall bring them to the attention of the other Member States.</p> <p>EL (Comments):</p> <p>What Is the meaning of “provided that those rules are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market.”</p> <p>Hellas is not allowing the import of mutilated dogs and cats unless it is for medical reason.</p> <p>According to the above does this mean that our rules by not allowing the import in Hellas of mutilated animals are inconsistent with this Regulation and interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market ?</p> <p>FI (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>1. This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from maintaining any stricter national rules aimed at a more extensive protection of the welfare of dogs and cats and in force at the time of entry into force of this Regulation, provided that those rules are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not <u>exceed the limits of what is appropriate and necessary in order to protect the welfare of dogs and cats.</u> interfere with the proper functioning</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>of the internal market. Before [<i>the date of application of this Regulation</i>], Member States shall inform the Commission about such national rules. The Commission shall bring them to the attention of the other Member States.</p> <p>FI (Comments):</p> <p>FI is concerned that many of the current national stricter rules aiming at protecting dogs and cats can be considered to interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market. In our view eg. any provision restricting the participation of certain kind of dogs or cats in competitions or restricting their use on breeding could be seen as such provisions according to TFEU 34. These provisions may have been justified on the grounds of eg. TFEU 36 provisions which can not be applied anymore once the rules of keeping of dogs or cats are harmonised. Therefore we suggest using a wording similar to Animal Health Law (Reg. (EU) 2016/429) Article 171.</p> <p>SK (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from maintaining any stricter national rules aimed at a more extensive traceability and protection of the welfare of dogs and cats and in force at the time of entry into force of this Regulation, provided that those rules are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market. Before [<i>the date of application of this Regulation</i>], Member States shall inform the Commission about such national rules. The Commission shall bring them to the attention of the other Member States.</p> <p>SK</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(Comments):</p> <p>SK requests to add the possibility of stricter national rules in connection with the identification, registration and traceability of animals in national territory.</p> <p>SK has established system of accompanying document issued by an official veterinarian when animals are moved from the selling (breeding) establishment to the assembly center.</p>
<p>2. This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from adopting stricter national measures aimed at ensuring more extensive protection of the welfare of dogs and cats kept in establishments within the territory of a Member State on the following animal welfare issues:</p>	<p>DE</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>2. This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from adopting stricter national measures aimed at ensuring more extensive protection of the welfare of dogs and cats kept in establishments within the territory of a Member State on the following animal welfare issues:</p> <p>DE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>See above. We would like to avoid an unnecessary restriction to the topics listed below. The topics listed below do not cover the possible need for national regulation.</p> <p>EL</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from adopting stricter national measures aimed at ensuring more extensive protection of the welfare of dogs and cats kept in establishments within the territory of a Member State on</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>the following animal welfare issues:</p> <p>SK (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from adopting stricter national measures aimed at ensuring more extensive traceability and protection of the welfare of dogs and cats kept in establishments within the territory of a Member State on the following animal welfare issues:</p>
(a) housing conditions;	<p>DE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(a) — housing conditions;</p> <p>DE (Comments):</p> <p>See above</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(a) — housing conditions;</p>
(b) mutilations;	<p>DE (Drafting Suggestions):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(b) — mutilations;</p> <p>DE (Comments): See above</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions): (b) — mutilations;</p> <p>IT (Comments): Before providing an opinion on this point, it should be clear whether mutilations (and other painful practices) are already prohibited, as desirable, in all Member States on all dogs and cats by article 15, without the exemptions from the obligations set by article 4. In our view, mutilations shall be prohibited on all dogs and cats (unless they are performed due to a medical indication with the sole purpose of improving the health of dogs and cat), regardless of the size of the establishment.</p>
(c) enrichment;	<p>DE (Drafting Suggestions): (c) — enrichment;</p> <p>DE</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(Comments):</p> <p>See above</p> <p>EL</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(e) — enrichment;</p>
<p>(d) selection and breeding programmes, including minimum and maximum age for breeding.</p>	<p>DE</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(d) — selection and breeding programmes, including minimum and maximum age for breeding.</p> <p>DE</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>See above</p> <p>EL</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(d) — selection and breeding programmes, including minimum and maximum age for breeding.</p> <p>MT</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(d) selection and breeding programmes, <u>including minimum and maximum age for breeding.</u></p> <p>MT</p> <p>(Comments):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>Regulating the minimum and maximum breeding age would need to be harmonised as stricter national rules could lead to unnecessary movements of animals for breeding purposes.</p> <p>NL (Comments):</p> <p>We interpret this to include the possibility to completely prohibit breeding with dogs and cats with detrimental features and breeding with dogs that are considered dangerous.</p> <p>SE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(d) selection and breeding programmes, including minimum and maximum age for breeding;</p>
	<p>BG (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p><u>e) identification and registration</u></p> <p>BG (Comments):</p> <p>We support the MSs who asked for this addition</p> <p>CY (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p><u>(e) Animal welfare competences of animal caretakers</u></p> <p><u>(f) Advisory animal welfare visits</u></p> <p><u>(g) Feeding and watering</u></p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p><u>(h) Health</u></p> <p><u>(i) Behavioural needs</u></p> <p>CY (Comments): We believe that other issues such as animal welfare competences of animal caretakers (article 9), animal welfare visits (article 10), feeding and watering, (article 11), health (article 13), and behavioural needs (article 14) should be included as well.</p> <p>DK (Drafting Suggestions): <u>e) management</u> <u>2a. This Regulation shall not prevent Member States from adopting stricter national measures aimed at ensuring more extensive protection of the traceability of dogs and cats kept in establishments within the territory of a Member.</u></p> <p>EL (Comments): In case the Regulation allows Member States to adopt stricter national measures a) frequency of breeding (especially after a cesarian section with no litter a bitch or queen shall have an extended period of rest.) b) chipping and register in the data (In Hellas chipping is mandatory the first two months before the litter leaves the bitch or the queen.) shall be added.</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>FI (Drafting Suggestions): <u>e) identification and registration.</u></p> <p>LU (Drafting Suggestions): <u>(e) Identification and registration</u></p> <p>LU (Comments): LU applies more stringent national measures imposing the obligation of identification for every dog and cat, irrespective of its placing on the market/supplying. Furthermore LU plans to make it mandatory to provide evidence of identification and registration for every person supplying animals (= no exceptions for natural persons supplying dogs and cats occasionally by other means than online platforms).</p> <p>NL (Drafting Suggestions): <u>(e) identification and registration of cats and dogs;</u></p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p data-bbox="577 284 1850 316"><u>(f) the keeping and showing of dogs and cats with detrimental features and of dangerous dogs</u></p> <p data-bbox="577 371 1299 403"><u>(g) delivery conditions for suppliers of dogs and cats.</u></p> <p data-bbox="577 515 622 547">NL</p> <p data-bbox="577 555 748 587">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 627 2074 707">(f) Because the demand for animals with certain (detrimental) features drives the breeding and (illegal) trade in these animals, we would like to be able to implement legislation that aims to lower the demand.</p> <p data-bbox="577 762 2074 906">A definition of dangerous dog should be included. Suggestion: a dog is considered dangerous when there is a high likelihood that it will cause harm to people or other animals, and/or when the impact of a bite is likely to be high due to the physical features and temperament of the dog.</p> <p data-bbox="577 946 2074 1145">(g) To improve responsible ownership (both in terms of animal welfare as safety), in NL we are planning to make it mandatory for every prospective dog owner to follow a (theoretical) course. This course will cover topics ranging from the physical and behavioural needs of dogs and dog body language to preventing biting incidents. A dog can only be sold to a person that has the certificate to proof that they have succesfully finished the course.</p> <p data-bbox="577 1185 622 1217">SE</p> <p data-bbox="577 1225 882 1257">(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p data-bbox="577 1281 1025 1313"><u>e) identification and registration.</u></p> <p data-bbox="577 1353 622 1385">SE</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(Comments):</p> <p>Sweden is positive to the proposal, but we wish to allow for Member States to adopt stricter national measures in regard to identification and registration.</p> <p>SI</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p><u>(e) health measures to improve animal welfare and consumer protection</u></p> <p>SI</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p><i>Explanation:</i></p> <p>V SI se širijo vektorske bolezni, ki so posledica večjega vnosa psov in mačk iz TC ali drugih mediteranskih DČ (leišmaniaza, tripanosomioza, erlihioza, transmisivni venerealni tumor) – morda pa tudi zaradi prisotnosti vektorjev (podnebne spremembe). Te bolezni imajo relativno dolgo inkubacijo. Nekatere so tudi zoonoze.</p> <p>SK</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>(e) identification, registration and traceability</p>
<p>Member States shall inform the Commission about such national rules before their adoption. The Commission shall bring them to the</p>	<p>DE</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>Member States shall inform the Commission about such national rules before their adoption. The Commission shall bring them to the attention of the other Member States.</p> <p>DE</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
attention of the other Member States.	<p>(Comments):</p> <p>We see no need to go beyond or repeat the horizontal notification requirements.</p>
<p>3. The measures referred to in paragraph 2 shall only be allowed provided that they are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market.</p>	<p>AT (Comments): The wording: “those rules are not inconsistent with this Regulation” should be defined in detail.</p> <p>DE (Drafting Suggestions): 3. — The measures referred to in paragraph 2 shall only be allowed provided that they are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market.</p> <p>DE (Comments): See above</p> <p>EL (Drafting Suggestions): The measures referred to in paragraph 2 shall only be allowed provided that they are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market.</p> <p>EL (Comments):</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>Hellas is not allowing the import of mutilated dogs and cats unless it is for medical reason.</p> <p>According to the above does this mean that our rules by not allowing the import in Hellas of mutilated animals are inconsistent with this Regulation and interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market ?</p> <p>FI (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>3. The measures referred to in paragraph 2 shall only be allowed provided that they are not inconsistent with this Regulation and do not <u>exceed the limits of what is appropriate and necessary in order to protect the welfare of dogs and cats.</u> interfere with the proper functioning of the internal market.</p> <p>FI (Comments):</p> <p>We would prefer the wording used in Art. 171 in AHL here as well. Our concern is that the proposed wording can be interpreted in a very restrictive manner unabling MS to adopt new stricter rules on animal protection.</p>
<p>4. Member States shall not prohibit or impede the placing on the market within their territory of dogs and cats kept in another Member State on the grounds that the dogs and</p>	<p>DE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>34. Member States shall not prohibit or impede the placing on the market within their territory of dogs and cats kept in another Member State on the grounds that the dogs and cats concerned have not been kept in accordance with its stricter national rules on animal welfare.</p> <p>DE</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
cats concerned have not been kept in accordance with its stricter national rules on animal welfare.	(Comments): Scrutiny reservation. Only acceptable for DE if the draft achieves a sufficient level of protection overall and leaves no unacceptable loopholes, particularly with regard to extreme breeding characteristics and amputations.
<i>Article 26</i>	
<i>Reporting and evaluation</i>	
1. On the basis of the reports received in accordance with Article 20 and additional relevant information, the Commission shall publish, by [7 years after the date of entry into force of this Regulation] and thereafter every 5 years, a	HR (Comments): See comment for art.20, paragraph 2.

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
monitoring report on the welfare of dogs and cats placed on the market in the Union.	
<p>2. By [15 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], the Commission shall carry out an evaluation of this Regulation, including an assessment of a possible maximum age for breeding of dogs and cats, and present a report on the main findings to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions.</p>	<p>HU (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>2. By [15 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], the Commission shall carry out an evaluation of this Regulation, including an assessment of a possible maximum age for breeding of dogs and cats, and present a report on the main findings to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions.</p> <p>HU (Comments):</p> <p>We do not see the reason behind highlighting the age limit of breeding animals as this is only one aspect of the Regulation. Therefore we propose to delete the concerning text.</p> <p>SE (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>2. By [15 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], the Commission shall carry out an evaluation of this Regulation; including an assessment of a possible maximum age for breeding of dogs and cats, and</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>present a report on the main findings to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions.</p> <p>SE (Comments):</p> <p>15 years is an unnecessarily long time to assess a possible maximum age for breeding dogs and cats. Sweden suggests removing this part and adding the suggested ammendment in Article 22 (h).</p>
<p>3. For the purposes of the reporting referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2, Member States shall provide the Commission with the information necessary for the preparation of those reports.</p>	
<p><i>Article 27</i></p>	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<i>Penalties</i>	
<p>Member States shall lay down the rules on penalties applicable to infringements of this Regulation and shall take all measures necessary to ensure that they are implemented. The penalties provided for shall be effective, proportionate and dissuasive.</p>	<p>SI (Comments): <i>Clarification needed:</i> To harmonise infringements, a list of infringements that should be penalised should be made (Annex IV?). Is the exchange of information on infringements between MS foreseen? Should a reference to already established routes be made? How the withdrawal of approval to breeding establishments will be notified to other MS?</p>
<p>Member States shall notify the Commission of those rules and of those measures and shall notify it, without delay, of any subsequent amendment affecting them.</p>	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
<i>Article 28</i>	
<i>Entry into force and application</i>	
This Regulation shall enter into force on the twentieth day following that of its publication in the <i>Official Journal of the European Union</i> .	
It shall apply from [2 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], unless otherwise provided for	SE (Drafting Suggestions): It shall apply from [2 3 years from the date of entry into force of this Regulation], unless otherwise provided for in this Regulation.

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
in this Regulation.	<p>SE (Comments):</p> <p>There is a need to analyse which adjustments in the national legislation that are necessary to adopt to the new EU Regulation and process such changes to the national legislation. To provide sufficient time for this process, Sweden suggests adding a year to the timeframe between the entry into force and general application of the Regulation. This would also be in line with the fact that many of the provisions of the Regulation have a later date for application.</p>
This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.	
ANNEX III	<p>CZ (Comments):</p> <p>We would like to ask when will it be possible to send comments on Annex II?</p>
<u>Collection of data</u>	

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
(pursuant to Article 20)	
<p>1. Number of dogs and cats microchipped per year as referred to in Article 17;</p>	<p>AT (Drafting Suggestions): Number of dogs and cats microchipped registered per year as referred to in Article 17</p> <p>BG (Drafting Suggestions): Number of dogs and cats microchipped and entered into the EU for placing on the market or supply per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p>DE (Drafting Suggestions): 1. Number of dogs and cats microchipped registered per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p>DE (Comments): According to art. 17, chipping and registration in the database are obligations of the establishments or private persons. The authorities are responsible for setting up and maintaining the database. Therefore, the authority can only indicate the registered animals. Theoretically, establishments or private persons can chip animals but not register</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>them or register microchips that are not implanted.</p> <p>DK (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>1. Number of dogs and cats microchipped registered per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p>DK (Comments):</p> <p>It should be registered dogs and cats since it reflects the real number and identity of the dogs and cats in a member state.</p> <p>FI (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>1. Number of dogs and cats registered microchipped per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p>HU (Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>1. Number of dogs and cats microchipped registered per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p>HU (Comments):</p> <p>The number of microchipped animals may not be equal to those of registered animals, as it would exclude imported animals marked in third countries. The number of registered animals is more informative and provides a more representative picture of the number of animals in the given member state.</p> <p>IT</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p data-bbox="577 268 882 300">(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p data-bbox="672 320 1984 352">Number of dogs and cats microchipped <u>identified and registered</u> per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p data-bbox="577 392 622 424">LU</p> <p data-bbox="577 432 882 464">(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p data-bbox="577 501 1693 533">Number of dogs and cats microchipped <u>registered</u> per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p data-bbox="577 572 622 604">LU</p> <p data-bbox="577 612 748 644">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="577 660 2007 804">A registered animal is also a microchipped animal but a microchipped is not always a registered. The data the Member States can provide will be outtaken from the databases where only registered animals can be taken into account, only microchipped but not registered animals can't be found in the database.</p> <p data-bbox="577 844 622 876">SE</p> <p data-bbox="577 884 882 916">(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p data-bbox="743 932 1912 963">1. Number of dogs and cats microchipped <u>registred</u> per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p data-bbox="577 1003 622 1035">SE</p> <p data-bbox="577 1043 748 1075">(Comments):</p> <p data-bbox="600 1091 2056 1291">This minor revision has been discussed early on during meetings of the Working Party on Animals and Veterinary Questions (Animal Welfare and Husbandry), where several MS deemed it more clear to change the wording to reference number of registrations, as opposed to number of microchipped dogs and cats. Sweden shares this sentiment.</p> <p data-bbox="577 1331 622 1362">SK</p>

Commission proposal	MS Drafting Suggestions and Comments
	<p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>Number of dogs and cats microchipped registered per year as referred to in Article 17;</p> <p>SK</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>SK suggests a change to "registered" so that there are also records of the number of imported registered animals.</p>
<p>2. Number of breeding establishment approved per year as referred to in Article 16.</p>	<p>IT</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>Number of breeding establishments approved per year as referred to in Article 16 <u>and notified as referred to in Article 7</u></p> <p>SK</p> <p>(Drafting Suggestions):</p> <p>Number of breeding establishment approved per year as referred to in Article 16.</p> <p>SK</p> <p>(Comments):</p> <p>SK suggests a change and exemption "per year" in relation to approved of the establishments, as the current status will not be monitored this ways. There will also be the deletion of approved establishments, not only the approval of new establishments.</p>