

<b>Title:</b> Improving animal welfare: Closed Circuit Television (CCTV) in Slaughterhouses. <b>IA No:</b> <i>INTERNAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT – LOW BUSINESS BURDEN</i> <b>RPC Reference No:</b> <b>Lead department or agency:</b> Defra <b>Other departments or agencies:</b> Food Standards Agency	<b>Impact Assessment (IA)</b>			
	<b>Date:</b> 06/02/2017			
	<b>Stage:</b> Development/Options			
	<b>Source of intervention:</b> Domestic			
	<b>Type of measure:</b> Secondary legislation			
<b>Contact for enquiries:</b> Richard Aram				
<b>Summary: Intervention and Options</b>				<b>RPC Opinion:</b> RPC Opinion Status

Cost of Preferred (or more likely) Option				
Total Net Present Value	Business Net Present Value	Net cost to business per year (EANDCB in 2014 prices)	One-In, Three-Out	Business Impact Target Status
N/A	-£2.63m	£0.3m	In scope	Qualifying provision

**What is the problem under consideration? Why is government intervention necessary?**

There is scope to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the monitoring and enforcement of animal welfare requirements in slaughterhouses, as shown by recent breaches. CCTV can provide an important complement to existing arrangements, which are implemented by the FSA. Voluntary uptake of CCTV by the meat industry is currently not comprehensive, in terms of the number of slaughterhouses covered, the areas where CCTV is present, and the access provided to CCTV footage to the FSA.

**What are the policy objectives and the intended effects?**

The Government has a manifesto commitment to make CCTV recording in slaughterhouses mandatory. The policy objective and intended effects are to improve animal welfare in slaughterhouses and provide assurance that all slaughterhouses are operating to high welfare standards. These will be achieved by the mandatory installation of CCTV in all approved slaughterhouses in areas where live animals are unloaded, kept, handled, stunned and killed, with the FSA having access to CCTV footage, the Food Business Operator (FBO) being required to store footage for a specified period, and footage being available for auditing purposes and having evidential status.

**What policy options have been considered, including any alternatives to regulation? Please justify preferred option (further details in Evidence Base)**

A voluntary approach has been adopted to date, recent breaches show that improvements are needed. Whilst the voluntary uptake of CCTV in slaughterhouses has increased over the last 6 years, it has now plateaued and only around 50% of red meat slaughterhouses and around 70% of poultry slaughterhouses have CCTV for animal welfare purposes. Where CCTV has been installed it is often not in all areas where live animals are kept (in 2016 the percentage of slaughterhouses with CCTV in particular locations were: unloading 46%; lairage 43%; race and restraint 37%; stun area 37%; and bleed area 38%. FSA 2016). The FSA are currently provided with access to CCTV coverage only where they have a suspicion of possible non-compliance rather than in a more unfettered way.

<b>Will the policy be reviewed?</b> It will be reviewed. <b>If applicable, set review date:</b> Month/Year						
Does implementation go beyond minimum EU requirements?			N/A			
Are any of these organisations in scope?			<b>Micro</b> Yes	<b>Small</b> Yes	<b>Medium</b> Yes	<b>Large</b> Yes
What is the CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent change in greenhouse gas emissions? (Million tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> equivalent)			<b>Traded:</b>		<b>Non-traded:</b>	

***I have read the Impact Assessment and I am satisfied that, given the available evidence, it represents a reasonable view of the likely costs, benefits and impact of the leading options.***

Signed by the responsible SELECT SIGNATORY: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

# Summary: Analysis & Evidence

# Policy Option 1

**Description:** Compulsory CCTV in slaughterhouses with retention for 90 days and unfettered access for authorised officers

## FULL ECONOMIC ASSESSMENT

Price Base Year	PV Base Year	Time Period Years 10	Net Benefit (Present Value (PV)) (£m)		
			Low: Optional	High: Optional	Best Estimate:

COSTS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Cost (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate			

### Description and scale of key monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Direct costs to slaughterhouses from the more widespread installation of CCTV: One-off costs of around £650,000 plus ongoing costs of around £260,000 per year. Ongoing costs include maintenance and storage of footage.

### Other key non-monetised costs by 'main affected groups'

Indirect costs to non-compliant slaughterhouses from achieving better compliance, for example training costs and costs of staff recruitment and replacement.

BENEFITS (£m)	Total Transition (Constant Price) Years	Average Annual (excl. Transition) (Constant Price)	Total Benefit (Present Value)
Low	Optional	Optional	Optional
High	Optional	Optional	Optional
Best Estimate			

### Description and scale of key monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

The benefits are not quantifiable sufficiently accurately.

### Other key non-monetised benefits by 'main affected groups'

Benefits to the public from improved animal welfare from the deterrent and preventive effects of CCTV.  
Benefits to slaughterhouses from improved consumer confidence that welfare standards are being met.  
Benefits to slaughterhouses from CCTV supporting improvements in business operations.

Key assumptions/sensitivities/risks

Discount rate (%)

3.5

Assume a neutral impact on FSA enforcement action; the FSA's ability to detect more breaches and to take enforcement action more quickly and easily is balanced by improved slaughterhouse compliance and by fewer breaches occurring.

Assume the number of slaughterhouses installing CCTV voluntarily has now reached a stable figure.

Assume that costs of the technology for CCTV will not change significantly over the next ten years.

## BUSINESS ASSESSMENT (Option 1)

Direct impact on business (Equivalent Annual) £m:			Score for Business Impact Target (qualifying provisions only): £1.5m
Costs: £0.3m	Benefits: £0m	Net: £0.3m	

## Evidence Base (for summary sheets)

***Given the low direct business costs of these proposals an Internal Impact Assessment has been produced. A full Final Impact Assessment will be produced post consultation.***

### Problem under consideration

1. Rules for the protection of animals at slaughter are contained in EU and domestic legislation. Legislation is aimed specifically at preventing cruelty or poor practice in slaughterhouses and it sets down specific requirements which must be complied with at all stages of the slaughter or killing process. The regulations make it an offence to cause any animal avoidable pain, distress or suffering.
2. Food Business Operators (FBOs) are primarily responsible for the welfare of animals in their premises. Official Veterinarians (OVs) of the Food Standards Agency (FSA) monitor and enforce the welfare regulations in all approved slaughterhouses to ensure that animals do not experience avoidable pain, distress or suffering during the slaughter process. OVs will take appropriate enforcement action when animal welfare incidents occur. However, OVs cannot be present at all parts of the slaughter process at all times and CCTV can help address this. In addition CCTV can provide the FBO and/or OV with a better view of hard to see areas such as the stunning area or within gas stunning systems.
3. In some recent cases of animal abuse at slaughterhouses where CCTV was not present, enforcement action would not have been possible without the covert filming made available to the FSA by animal welfare NGOs. These kinds of case have increased calls from animal welfare NGOs (e.g. RSPCA, Compassion in World Farming, World Horse Welfare) and veterinary organisations (e.g. British Veterinary Association) for mandatory CCTV in slaughterhouses for animal welfare purposes. These organisations also consider that mandatory CCTV would improve public confidence in the sector.
4. More than 10,000 people have signed government petitions calling for mandatory CCTV in slaughterhouses (GOV.UK e-petitions). It has been noted in Parliamentary debates that equine owners, for whom the slaughterhouse can be a cost effective method of disposal for some horses, can be unwilling to use slaughterhouses without assurance of a good death for their animal (Hansard, 29 November 2016).
5. Voluntary uptake of CCTV by slaughterhouses is currently not universal nor comprehensive in providing for monitoring and verification of compliance with animal welfare requirements (See Table 1, FSA Survey data).
6. OVs currently have power to seize CCTV footage where a breach of the regulations is suspected, but OVs cannot routinely view CCTV footage in an unfettered way. There are calls by some stakeholders for authorised officers such as OVs to have unfettered access to CCTV footage. Almost one fifth (18%) of slaughterhouses have said they would not allow unfettered access to CCTV footage for OVs of the FSA<sup>1</sup>.
7. This IA relates to England only. Animal welfare is a delegated responsibility. The Devolved Administrations are also interested in this issue, and the Welsh Government recently published an industry report on CCTV in slaughterhouses - <http://gov.wales/docs/drah/publications/161222-cctv-in-wales-slaughter-houses-en.pdf>.

---

<sup>1</sup> FSA CCTV Survey 2016 - <https://www.food.gov.uk/news-updates/news/2016/15460/results-of-cctv-survey-in-slaughterhouses-published>

## Rationale for intervention

8. Mandatory CCTV should improve the efficiency of monitoring and enforcement activity, by providing OV's with the information they need more readily and more conveniently – mandatory CCTV addresses an information asymmetry which exists between the regulator and the regulated. As a result of enhanced OV capability and of any behavioural change on the part of slaughterhouses, mandatory CCTV should lead to improved compliance by the sector, which may support improved public confidence and improved consumer confidence that welfare standards are being delivered. Slaughterhouses create a negative externality on other slaughterhouses when they abuse animal welfare and when this generates wider adverse reputational costs applying to the whole sector including the compliant majority.

9. The Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) was commissioned by GB Governments to produce an independent assessment of the benefits of CCTV in slaughterhouses. Their report was published in February 2015. CCTV was identified as offering tangible benefits in slaughterhouses as an important complement to official physical observation, including in terms of verifying slaughterhouse practices and effectively recording animal welfare abuses. FAWC recommended that all approved slaughterhouse operators should install CCTV in all areas where live animals are kept and where animals are stunned and killed<sup>2</sup>. FAWC also identified benefits to the business from CCTV installation.

10. Voluntary uptake of CCTV in slaughterhouses has now plateaued with only around 50% of red meat slaughterhouses and around 70% of poultry slaughterhouses having adopted CCTV in some areas for animal welfare purposes (FSA CCTV Survey 2016). Those slaughterhouses that have installed CCTV tend to be those ones that are part of an industry assurance scheme and/or are supplying one of the major retailers where CCTV is often demanded as part of meeting the retailer's specification.

11. The move by many larger slaughterhouses to install CCTV has helped ensure that the majority of animals are now slaughtered in plants that have CCTV installed for animal welfare purposes. Nonetheless, there are still significant numbers of animals that have no such protection and are slaughtered in premises without CCTV in England (FSA CCTV Survey 2016):

- 1% of poultry, equating to around 9,000,000 birds per year;
- 8% of cattle, equating to around 200,000 head of cattle per year;
- 4% of pigs, equating to around 400,000 pigs per year; and
- 12% of sheep, equating to around 1,500,000 sheep per year.

12. The FSA survey shows that for those slaughterhouses that have installed CCTV, coverage of live animals is not comprehensive with many premises not having cameras in all areas where live animals are kept and where animal welfare could be compromised. In 2016 the percentage of slaughterhouses with CCTV in particular locations were: unloading 46%; lairage 43%; race and restraint 37%; stun area 37%; and bleed area 38% (FSA 2016 survey).

---

<sup>2</sup>[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/400796/Opinion\\_on\\_CCTV\\_in\\_slaughterhouses.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/400796/Opinion_on_CCTV_in_slaughterhouses.pdf)

**Table 1. Locations of CCTV in slaughterhouses in England and Wales 2016, broken down by red and white meat slaughterhouses:**

Type of slaughterhouse	Unloading	Lairage	Race & Restraint	Stun area	Bleed area
Red meat	42%	39%	34%	37%	32%
White meat	56%	55%	44%	38%	52%

13. CCTV can enable official observation and verification of animal welfare incidents, and can contribute to auditing and verification of slaughterhouse compliance with the legislation. CCTV offers authenticity and transparency and can be retained for future review and/or for evidential purposes.

14. OVs can currently seize CCTV footage if they suspect a breach of the regulations. Unfettered access for OVs at all times would provide more opportunities to assess compliance with the regulations on a proactive and reactive basis. Increased CCTV coverage combined with improved access to CCTV footage may also lead to behavioural change in some slaughterhouses, in particular to improved practices and to better compliance.

### **Policy objective**

15. The primary policy objective is to maintain and improve animal welfare standards in all slaughterhouses and provide assurance that this is the case. A related objective is to ensure that FSA OVs operate as effectively and as efficiently as possible, by providing them in the best way with the information they need to do their jobs.

16. The proposed regulation would require all slaughterhouses to install CCTV in all areas where live animals are present, e.g. where they are unloaded, kept, handled, stunned and killed; and would provide that authorised staff of the FSA would have routine access to CCTV coverage. The Food Business Operator would be required to store CCTV footage for 90 days, in line with FAWC recommendations.

### **Description of options considered (including status-quo)**

17. In 2012 the Government consulted on introducing mandatory CCTV in slaughterhouses as part of its consultation on the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing Regulations and decided to maintain a voluntary approach for the time being. From 2011 to 2013 there was an increase in CCTV uptake but from 2013 until now there has been little further uptake.

18. The voluntary option (status quo) was supported by the Government and has failed to provide universal adoption of CCTV for animal welfare purposes. Where CCTV has been installed its coverage has not been comprehensive, leaving areas of key welfare vulnerability without real time, objective observation and recording (see table 1). Access to CCTV coverage has not been unfettered.

19. Defra lawyers have advised that it should be possible to make provision for mandatory CCTV in all slaughterhouses through an affirmative statutory instrument under the Animal Welfare Act 2006. This is the preferred option and as part of this, OVs would have access to CCTV footage to improve their enforcement ability. This preferred option would be treated as an enforcement measure to ensure compliance with the direct requirements of the EU legislation. As such this would fall under the province of the competent authority of the Member State, rather than taking the form of a new national rule that would require notification to the EU Commission.

## Monetised and non-monetised costs and benefits of each option (including admin burden)

### Costs

#### Costs to slaughterhouses

20. The following direct costs may fall to the slaughterhouse industry in aggregate. These figures should be viewed as initial illustrative estimations. They aim to provide an estimated order of magnitude. The consultation exercise will seek to obtain more evidence on the size and nature of these costs.

##### *One-off direct costs*

21. We estimate the total capital cost of new CCTV installation may be around **£650,000** across the sector. For slaughterhouses with no CCTV at present we have assumed an estimated one-off cost of around £2,500 (in relation to 20 poultry slaughterhouses plus 92 red meat slaughterhouses, totalling around £280,000). For slaughterhouses with partial CCTV coverage at present we have assumed an estimated one-off cost of around £500 per additional area without coverage now (172 additional areas for poultry slaughterhouses plus 574 additional areas for red meat slaughterhouses, totalling around £370,000). We may assume that CCTV equipment has a 10 year life span.

##### *Ongoing direct costs*

22. We estimate the cost of daily oversight and maintenance of CCTV to be around £210,000. This is based on: an assumption that it takes on average 30 mins/day to check and amend CCTV cameras; FSA data on the operating hours of slaughterhouses; hourly pay data for those involved in the processing and preserving of meat (Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2016). 30% is added to cover costs like employer NI contribution, pension contribution, holiday pay etc.

23. In addition annual maintenance costs are estimated to be around £30,000 based on assumed annual service charge of 5% of the initial capital value of the additional CCTV equipment (i.e. 5% of around £650,000).

24. We estimate that storage costs for CCTV footage may be around £10,000. This is based on a maximum estimated annual cost of £25 per year/slaughterhouse for those without any CCTV in place currently and an additional £10 per year/area for those slaughterhouses where current CCTV coverage is partial. This is calculated on the basis that 90 days of CCTV footage from 5 cameras would require approximately 2TB of storage.

25. We estimate that other ongoing operating costs such as electricity are likely to be minimal, for example up to around £10,000 per year.

26. In summary we estimate that the total direct ongoing costs to slaughterhouses may be around **£260,000** per year.

##### *One-off and ongoing indirect costs*

27. As a result of more comprehensive and more accessible CCTV coverage, we expect there would be behavioural change on the part of slaughterhouses which are not currently fully compliant with existing requirements. We do not expect this to apply in relation to slaughterhouses which are currently fully compliant. In particular we consider that there should be an improvement in slaughterhouses practices, leading to better compliance, i.e. that these CCTV reforms should have a preventive and deterrent effect. This may be associated with both one-off costs and with ongoing costs. This may include costs of staff training and staff recruitment and replacement. There may also be costs in terms

of the throughput of animals. Some of these improved practices may also generate business benefits (see benefits section).

28. Slaughterhouses which are not fully compliant may incur other costs associated with changes in FSA enforcement activity. For example more comprehensive and more accessible CCTV coverage may make it quicker and easier for the FSA to issue enforcement notices and/or to support prosecutions. Whether there is an overall increase in enforcement notices and in prosecutions will depend upon how this balances out relative to improved slaughterhouse compliance resulting from the preventive and deterrent effect of CCTV. Our current assumption is that there will be no net increase in FSA enforcement activity.

### **Costs to the FSA**

29. We anticipate that more comprehensive and accessible CCTV coverage would mean that FSA OV's will spend more of their routine inspection time looking at CCTV footage. However, given the role of CCTV in facilitating and improving the efficiency of inspection and of enforcement we consider that the same level of OV resource will be required in future but that OV's may be engaged in different activities. This will also depend upon the behavioural response of slaughterhouses. For example, whilst CCTV may present OV's with more information in a more accessible way, and may lead to a greater number of breaches being identified, CCTV may also lead to slaughterhouses improving their compliance performance and to fewer breaches occurring. In terms of the mix of OV activities, CCTV may possibly result in a greater number of welfare notices if all else remains equal, but CCTV should reduce the resourcing costs associated with making a judgement on the need for, and subsequently supporting, successful prosecutions. FSA costs are covered largely by industry charges and also by other parts of government, e.g. by Defra.

### **Costs to other parts of the Government**

30. Costs to the Government, including to Defra, the Crown Prosecution Service, and the Ministry of Justice, are assumed to remain broadly neutral, on the understanding that the FSA will be engaged in the same level of enforcement activity as now. As mentioned, whilst CCTV may lead to more breaches being detected and more action being taken, it should also lead to improved compliance and to fewer breaches arising.

## **Benefits**

### **Benefits to the public**

31. One of the primary benefits of CCTV is assumed to be improved compliance with animal welfare at slaughter requirements, resulting from the deterrent effect of CCTV combined with the enhanced ability of the FSA to take enforcement action. There is evidence from other contexts on the effectiveness of CCTV as a deterrent (e.g. the use of speed cameras and of security cameras).

32. Surveys consistently show that the public believe farm animal welfare is important: e.g. more than a third of UK respondents (39%) answered "yes, certainly" when asked whether the welfare of farm animals in the UK should be better protected than it is now with an additional 37% of UK respondents answering, "yes, probably" (Eurobarometer 2016\*). While there is an apparent discrepancy between public stated concerns/stated willingness to pay for welfare benefits and actual purchasing behaviour in relation to animal welfare, this is in part explained by consumers' expectation that government action and retailer assurance guarantees minimum welfare standards. While meta-analyses exist of public willingness to pay for farm animal welfare more generally (Lagerkvist and Hess 2011), we have not attempted to monetise the public or consumer value delivered by assumed improved compliance with welfare at slaughter requirements.

## **Benefits to slaughterhouses**

33. To the extent that consumers value animal welfare, including welfare at slaughter, CCTV may provide greater assurance down-stream in the supply chain around the slaughter process and confidence in the products which they source. Indeed many retailers currently require CCTV. This enhanced consumer confidence may ultimately generate greater returns for slaughterhouses, although this has not been monetised.

34. Aside from generating business efficiency improvements associated with improved compliance, CCTV can also be used as a tool to help identify and implement other business improvements. For example, FAWC suggest that CCTV could provide the following benefits to food business operators, which have not been monetised:

- contributing to reviews of effectiveness of operations and enable the food business operator to make improvements to processes and operating instructions;
- a valuable training tool for slaughterhouse staff;
- encouraging collective responsibility in slaughterhouse staff;
- enabling disputes to be resolved more easily.

## **Benefits to the FSA**

35. FAWC's report identified a series of benefits for inspection and enforcement. CCTV can observe and record real-time slaughterhouse processes, record individual events and contribute information to the auditing of animal welfare. It can enable the OV to observe live animals in high welfare risk areas as well as those that are inaccessible or dangerous to people. Ante-mortem inspection via CCTV can detect unguarded behaviours that might be hidden from human observers, e.g. lameness in sheep. We therefore expect that while CCTV will facilitate more comprehensive inspection and enable breaches to be detected more easily. In the context of taking enforcement action, CCTV footage has authenticity and transparency as evidence and can be retained for long periods. This is particularly valuable for prosecutions, making the process for building a case for prosecution more efficient as well as strengthening the overall case presented, and minimising dispute.

36. Overall we consider that the impact on FSA resources may be broadly neutral. In particular whilst these CCTV reforms may lead to more breaches being detected and to more enforcement action being taken more quickly and more easily, we also consider that the deterrent and preventive effects of CCTV should lead to fewer breaches occurring.

## **Benefits to other parts of the Government**

37. Benefits to the Government, including to Defra, the Crown Prosecution Service, and the Ministry of Justice, are assumed to remain broadly neutral, on the understanding that the FSA will be engaged in the same level of enforcement activity as now.

## **EANDCB and OI30**

38. Direct costs to businesses have been quantified, but the benefits to business have not been quantified. The direct costs to business constitute one-off costs of around £650,000 plus ongoing annual costs of around £260,000. Using the BIT Assessment Calculator the EANDCB is £0.3m and the business NPV is -£2.63m. This is a qualifying regulatory provision under the SBEE act and is in scope of One-In, Three Out.



## **Risks and assumptions**

39. It is assumed that the number of slaughterhouses installing CCTV has now reached a stable figure and that more slaughterhouses are unlikely to install CCTV without a requirement to do so. It is assumed that costs of the technology for CCTV will not increase significantly over the next couple of years. It is assumed that the level of enforcement activity will remain broadly neutral as the improved ability to detect breaches and to take enforcement action may be balanced by fewer breaches arising.

## **Small and micro business assessment**

40. We are aware there are several large companies that run slaughterhouses in the red meat and poultry sectors but data from public records shows that between 50 and 75% of slaughterhouses are small or micro businesses. We recognise that the impact on small businesses may be more of a financial burden however many of these small businesses already have CCTV and exempting small businesses from the regulation would undermine the effectiveness of the policy objectives. However, Government needs to be proportionate and fully assess the impact on smaller businesses of requiring CCTV to be installed. As such we are seeking views on this as part of this consultation.

41. Smaller premises should be able to meet the proposed requirements with a less extensive CCTV system than larger premises, thus limiting costs. We recognise that the financial impact on small businesses may still be considered a burden, however, we do believe that exempting small businesses from the regulation would undermine the effectiveness of the policy objectives.

## **Summary and preferred option with description of implementation plan**

42. The current voluntary approach to the installation and operation of CCTV in slaughterhouses to improve animal welfare has not provided universal or comprehensive uptake. In order to realise the potential benefits to improved animal welfare (and other benefits which could accrue to the FBO) in all slaughterhouses a mandatory approach is preferred. This consultation is seeking views on this preferred approach and information on costs.

43. If the Government decides to proceed with making CCTV compulsory in slaughterhouses, then secondary legislation under the Animal Welfare Act 2006 would be necessary. The Government would decide on the implementation date depending on responses to this consultation. There may be a need for phased implementation to allow for the rate of investment for small and micro businesses.

44. FSA would enforce the regulation alongside their existing enforcement role in the slaughterhouse. FSA would need to consider the resource implications on an operational basis.

## **References**

FSA CCTV Survey 2016 - <https://www.food.gov.uk/news-updates/news/2016/15460/results-of-cctv-survey-in-slaughterhouses-published>

The Opinion on CCTV in slaughterhouses by the Farm Animal Welfare committee was published in 2015, so it is not considered necessary to repeat this analysis.

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/400796/Opinion on CCTV in slaughterhouses.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/400796/Opinion_on_CCTV_in_slaughterhouses.pdf)

FSA Animal Welfare Surveys 2015, 2013 and 2011 –

<https://www.food.gov.uk/enforcement/sectorrules/animal-welfare/animal-welfare-survey>

GOV.UK e-petitions -

<https://petition.parliament.uk/petitions?q=CCTV+mandatory+slaughterhouses&state=all>

CCTV in equine slaughterhouses - Hansard, 29 November 2016,

[https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2016-11-29/debates/A390C501-4257-447B-A30B-76EFCC05583C/EquineSlaughterhouses\(CCTV\)](https://hansard.parliament.uk/commons/2016-11-29/debates/A390C501-4257-447B-A30B-76EFCC05583C/EquineSlaughterhouses(CCTV))

Eurobarometer 2016 -

<http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/SPECIAL/surveyKy/2096>

Welsh Government recently published a report on CCTV in slaughterhouses -

<http://gov.wales/docs/drah/publications/161222-cctv-in-wales-slaughter-houses-en.pdf>