Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs

Great Britain consultation on poultry catching and handling

Summary of responses and government response

June 2025

Llywodraeth Cymru
Welsh Government

Scottish Government
Riaghaltas na h-Alba

We are the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. We're responsible for improving and protecting the environment, growing the green economy and supporting our world-class food, farming and fishing industries.

We work closely with our 33 agencies and arm's length bodies on our ambition to make our air purer, our water cleaner, our land greener and our food more sustainable. Our mission is to restore and enhance the environment for the next generation, and to leave the environment in a better state than we found it.

This publication is available at www.gov.uk/government/publications

Any enquiries regarding this publication should be sent to us at

poultry.catching@defra.gov.uk

Contents

Executive summary

About the consultation and the analysis of responses

This document provides an overview of the responses and substantive points raised by respondents to the GB-wide consultation, on the permitted methods for the manual lifting and carrying (‘catching’) of poultry for transportation in connection with an economic activity, which ran from 10 March to 2 May 2025.

The consultation sought views on proposals to provide clarity on the permitted methods of catching chickens during transport operations, pending further research in this area. In particular, it sought views on a proposed amendment to assimilated Regulation (EC) No. 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations ('Regulation 1/2005’). This amendment would seek to remove an existing discrepancy between Regulation 1/2005 and established GB statutory guidance to legally permit chickens (including laying hens and meat ‘broiler’ chickens) to be caught by two legs, in line with the GB statutory guidance.

This consultation also sought to gain further information regarding the methods used to catch turkeys, to help determine whether it should also be legally permissible to catch turkeys (within a certain weight range) by two legs.

Overview of the analysis of responses

We received 103 responses to the consultation. The largest number of responses were from members of the public, and this included a campaign response. There were also responses from non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the poultry sector, local authorities, academics and veterinarians.

The main consultation proposal, to legally permit laying hens and meat chickens to be caught by two legs, in line with existing GB statutory guidance, was not supported by most respondents. However, it should be noted that this result was affected by a campaign response. The responses from the poultry sector consisted of a small number of individual responses by poultry producers and catching companies, with the sector trade bodies collating responses on behalf of their members and the catching companies.

Although the campaign response was not primarily in favour of amending the legislation (question 9a), it did acknowledge that the British poultry industries were not currently well-placed to transition to upright body catching. It conceded that amending the legislation in favour of two-leg catching would provide an appropriate intermediate step (away from one-leg catching), so long as a transition to upright catching was mandated at the end of a five-year period.

The poultry industries highlighted several key barriers that would impact the success of any commercial transition from their existing practices (of one and two-leg catching) to alternative catch methods. These included labour shortages, human health and safety concerns, the cost and the alterations to infrastructure that would in practice be required.

The question of whether it should also be legally permissible to lift turkeys (weighing up to 10kg) by two legs was also not supported by most respondents. A key concern here was that the weight range was too high. Compiled industry responses confirmed that only turkeys up to 5kg are routinely caught by two legs while, at higher weights, other methods are used.

What we will we do next

The UK, Welsh and Scottish Governments would like to thank all those who took the time to engage with this consultation for their views and feedback. We have carefully considered all the information and responses submitted and have agreed the following next steps.

We will remove the discrepancy between the legislation and the established GB statutory guidance for laying hens and meat chickens, by amending Regulation 1/2005 to exempt chickens and turkeys from the prohibition in paragraph 1.8 of Chapter III of Annex I on the lifting of animals by their legs.

The amendment will also make it clear that when chickens, and turkeys weighing 5kg and less, are caught by the legs, they must be caught, lifted and carried by two legs. In the case of turkeys weighing more than 5kg, the amendment will prohibit their lifting or carrying in an inverted position, whether by holding the legs or otherwise.

This will provide the egg, meat chicken and turkey industries, and their associated catching companies, with clarity on the legal requirements that apply to the catching of poultry during transport and related operations.

Responses to the consultation, on how additional robust data on the relationship between different manual catching methods and welfare outcomes be gathered and analysed, will inform an ongoing workstream which seeks to address important gaps in the evidence base. Defra has now commissioned a research project to study the impact of various catching methods (including two-leg and upright) within the meat chicken, laying hen and turkey sectors and different housing systems. This will seek to establish whether a comprehensive transition to upright catching could be practically feasible in the longer-term and deliver clear improvements in welfare outcomes.

Introduction

About the consultation

On 10 March 2025 Defra, the Welsh Government and the Scottish Government issued a GB-wide consultation on proposals to provide clarity on the permitted methods of catching chickens during transport operations and more specific proposals to amend assimilated Regulation (EC) No. 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport and related operations ('Regulation 1/2005') in England, Wales and Scotland.

The consultation closed at 23:59 on 2 May 2025.

The consultation specifically sought views on a proposed amendment that would remove an existing discrepancy between Regulation 1/2005 and established GB statutory guidance and legally permit chickens (including laying hens and meat 'broiler' chickens) to be caught by two legs, in line with the statutory guidance.

This consultation also sought to gain further information regarding the methods used to catch turkeys, to help determine whether an additional amendment should also make it legally permissible to catch turkeys (within a certain weight range) by two legs.

As the EU version of Regulation 1/2005 falls within scope of the Windsor Framework, that version continues to apply in Northern Ireland and, as such, the proposed legislative amendments presented within the consultation would only apply in England, Scotland and Wales.

Within this summary of responses, we report the number (and proportion) of respondents that held a specific view when answering each closed question and present a qualitative thematic analysis of information provided in response to each open question, to allow full consideration of the range of issues raised by respondents and differences in opinion.

Responses to the consultation

In total we received 103 responses to the consultation. These were made up of:

- 4 collated industry responses (compiled by the relevant sector trade body and membership organisations on behalf of their many members and the poultry catching companies)
- 35 campaign responses (identified via significant similarities in the text submitted)
- 64 individual responses

98 responses were submitted through the Citizen Space survey, and 5 were received by email. Where possible, these email responses have been aligned with those from

Citizen Space. A quantitative or qualitative analysis of the responses to each of the consultation questions is summarised under each of the headings in this report.

We are grateful to everyone who took the time to respond to the consultation. The breakdown of respondents is shown in Tables 1 and 2, below.

Geographical coverage

The overwhelming majority of respondents (84% of organisations and 82% of individuals) were based in England. There was additional representation from elsewhere in Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Table 1: The geographical location of the respondents in terms of those responding as an organisation or as an individual.

Geographical coverage	Organisation	Individual
England	32 (84%)	53 (82%)
Scotland	4 (11%)	6 (9%)
Wales	1 (3%)	3 (5%)
Northern Ireland	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Not UK-based (Europe)	0 (0%)	2 (3%)
Outside Europe	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
Total	*38 (37%)*	*65 (63%)*

Type of respondents

We were informed by a retailer that the lack of input from their sector was due to a decision that their suppliers would respond individually or through collated responses organised by sector trade body and membership organisations.

To help us analyse responses, we grouped respondents into 'types' of stakeholders as shown in Table 2, below. We refer to these types of stakeholders throughout the rest of the summary of responses. The respondents were grouped as follows:

- Academics = 9 respondents
- Local authorities = 6 respondents
- General public = 44 respondents
- NGOs = 20 respondents
- Poultry industry = 22 respondents
- Veterinarians = 2 respondents

Respondents that selected ‘other’ were allocated the stakeholder ‘type’ most relevant to the information they provided. Most were members of the public that didn’t identify as a ‘consumer’.

Table 2: The breadth of roles represented by the respondents. The total number of responses add up to more than 100% as some respondents selected multiple roles

Type of respondent	Number of responses	Stakeholder 'type'
Academic	9 (9%)	Academic
Animal welfare organisation	19 (18%)	NGOs
Consumer	37 (36%)	General public
Local authority	6 (6%)	Local authorities
Farm assurance scheme	1 (1%)	Poultry Industry
Farming organisation or trade body	5 (5%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry breeder (meat chickens)	1 (1%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry breeder (laying hens)	1 (1%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry breeder (turkey)	0 (0%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry catcher	5 (5%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry meat farmer (chickens)	7 (7%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry meat farmer (turkeys)	1 (1%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry meat farmer (other)	0 (0%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry meat integrator	1 (1%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry processor	4 (4%)	Poultry Industry
Poultry transporter	4 (4%)	Poultry Industry
Pullet rearer	2 (2%)	Poultry Industry
Sector trade body or membership organisation	4 (4%)	Poultry Industry
Table egg producer (chicken)	5 (5%)	Poultry Industry
Table egg producer (other)	0 (0%)	Poultry Industry
Veterinarian	1 (1%)	Veterinarians
Retailer	0 (0%)	No responses
Other	14 (14%)	Added to the most relevant stakeholder 'type'

Responses by question

Views on whether it should be legally permissible to catch chickens by two legs

Q9a. Should it be legally permissible to catch chickens by two legs for the purpose of loading and unloading for transport?

Table 3: Responses to the closed question of whether it should be permissible to catch chickens by two legs

Response	Total	Percent
Agree	41	40%
Disagree	61	59%
Don't know	0	0%
Not answered	1	1%

Most respondents, 61 of the 103 (59%), disagreed with the proposal to amend the legislation to permit chickens to be caught by two legs, in-line with the GB statutory guidance. Of these, opinion was polarised between those that supported one-leg catching (2 responses from poultry industry stakeholders) and those that supported upright body catching in preference to two-leg catching.

Of the 59 responses in favour of upright body catching, the stakeholder breakdown was as follows:

- General public = 38 responses (of which 35 were part of a campaign response)
- NGOs = 16 responses
- Academics = 4 responses
- Local authorities = 1 response

The stakeholder breakdown of the 41 (40%) respondents that were supportive of the proposal were as follows:

- Poultry industry = 20 responses
- Academics = 5 responses
- General public = 5 responses
- Local authorities = 5 responses
- NGOs = 4 responses
- Veterinarians = 2 responses

Q9b. If yes, please provide any information you can to support your view

Summary of the key themes for the open-ended question 9b:

Those respondents that supported the proposal were primarily of the opinion that 2-leg catching was not detrimental to bird welfare and this method was perceived to be associated with shorter catch times and lower costs, compared to upright catching.

Other themes included:

- two-leg catching is better for the health and well-being of the catching team than upright catching
- upright catching is unsuited to certain poultry housing systems
- two-leg catching provides an acceptable transitional step between one-leg and upright catching
- there is currently insufficient labour resource available within GB to accommodate upright catching

A small number of respondents in favour of the proposal highlighted the benefit of bringing consistency and clarity to the legal catching requirements.

To note: those respondents that disagreed with the proposal were given the opportunity to outline their reason(s) for this elsewhere in the consultation (see question 23, p.25).

Catch methods in current use

Q10. Do you or your organisation catch chickens for the purpose of loading and unloading operations?

Although only a relatively small number of respondents, 19 out of the 103 (18%), stated that they catch chickens for the purpose of loading and unloading, several of these were collated responses (having been submitted by sector trade bodies on behalf of their members and the poultry catching companies). Most respondents (84, 82%) were not involved in the catching of chickens or declined to answer.

Table 4: Responses to the closed question of whether the respondent or their organisation catch chickens

Response	Total	Percent
Yes	19	18%
No	72	70%
Not answered	12	12%

The following questions (Q11 to 16) were answered only by the 19 respondents that catch chickens.

Q11. What sector and housing system do you work with?

There was a broad coverage in experience across sectors and housing systems amongst the 19 respondents that were actively involved in catching chickens. Most had experience working with meat chickens (10 respondents), floor-housed laying hens (9 respondents) and aviary-housed laying hens (9 respondents). The sectors

and housing systems that attracted the least respondents included layer breeders (3 respondents) and caged pullets (2 respondents).

Table 5: Responses to the closed question asking which sector and housing system respondents work with. Only those who catch chickens were asked this question (as indicated in response to question 10). The responses add up to more than 19 as several respondents selected more than one answer.

Response	Total
Laying hen pullets: caged	2
Laying hen pullets: floor-housed	7
Laying hen pullets: multi-tier	7
Laying hen: caged table egg production	7
Laying hen: floor-housed table egg production	9
Laying hen: aviary-housed table egg production	9
Laying hen: layer breeders	3
Meat chickens: broilers	10
Meat chickens: broiler breeders	5

Q12a. What method of chicken catching do you or your organisation use?

Although the 19 respondents that catch chickens collectively claimed to have experience in catching by a range of different methods, we were not able to identify the extent of their experience for every method from the information provided. Most (16 responses) report catching by two-legs. Just less than half (9 responses) catch using an 'other' method, while upright catching was the method least used (7 responses).

Table 6: Responses to the closed question enquiring as to which chicken catching methods are used**.** Only those who catch chickens were asked this question (as indicated in response to question 10). The responses add up to more than 19 as several respondents selected more than one answer.

Response	Total
Two-leg	16
Upright	7
Other	9
Prefer not to say	0

Although 7 respondents claimed to use upright catching this did not appear to be reflective of the commercial standard. Two of these respondents were academics, 2

were NGOs, 1 was an egg producer that used upright catching when there was a need to pick up an individual bird, and 2 stakeholders (associated with the meat chicken industry) went on to clarify that one-leg catching was their default method.

Most respondents that selected ‘other’ specified that a one-leg catching method was used and it was apparent that meat chickens, and some laying hens, are currently caught by one leg. One respondent catches meat chickens mechanically, while another didn’t disclose the catching method.

These findings do not appear to be representative of all sectors of the poultry industry. Additional information supplied as part of collated industry responses estimated that 100% of broiler breeders are caught by two legs at transfer (from rear to adult housing) and that the two-leg method is widely used by the egg industry. Information relating to the meat chicken industry, again supplied as part of a collated industry response, estimated that single leg catching currently accounts for 88% of meat chickens, while 7% are mechanically harvested and 5% are caught by two legs.

Q12b. If multiple catching methods were selected, please provide additional information on when, and why, each is most likely to be utilised

Summary of the key themes for the open-ended question 12b:

Out of the 10 respondents that catch chickens using multiple methods the main factor specified as responsible for determining the method used was the sector (i.e., whether the birds were meat chickens, laying hens or pullets). Other considerations included animal welfare, the housing system, relevant assurance scheme standards and producer preference.

Q12c. If a single method was selected, please provide additional information as to why this method was chosen

Summary of the key themes for the open-ended question 12c:

Out of the 8 respondents that catch chickens using a single method, factors that influenced their method of choice included relevant assurance scheme standards, the speed of the catch method, greater accuracy during loading (of crates and modules) and animal welfare.

Half of these respondents chose not to justify their reason.

Request for data relating to labour requirements and catch timings

Q13. How long does it take to catch a full (transport lorry) load? For each scenario, please select from the relevant options provided and enter the number of birds caught and the corresponding time

Information relevant to this question was submitted by 16 respondents. These included individual responses and collated responses from industry stakeholders.

Table 7: Responses to the open question asking for information on catch team size and catch timings. This information has been converted to the number of birds caught per hour and is summarised per sector.

(a.) Laying hens

Housing system	Catch method	Catch team size	Transport container	Birds per hour [Number of responses]
Cage	One-leg	>8	Module	5000 [1]
Cage	Two-leg	>8	Module	2534 – 3040 [2]
Cage	Two-leg	>8	Crate	1000 [1]
Flat-deck	One-leg	6	Module	6000 [1]
Flat-deck	One-leg	>8	Module	3750 – 4224 [2]
Flat-deck	Two-leg	7	Module	3000 [1]
Flat-deck	Two-leg	>8	Module	3500 [2]
Flat-deck	Two-leg	>8	Crate	667 [1]
Multi-tier or aviary	One-leg	6	Module	6500 [1]
Multi-tier or aviary	Two-leg	>8	Module	2533 – 4000 [5]

(b.) Pullets

Housing system	Catch method	Catch team size	Transport container	Birds per hour [Number of responses]
Cage	Two-leg	8	Crate	3378 [1]
Cage	Two-leg	>8	Module	4000 [1]
Floor	Two-leg	8	Crate	2000 [1]
Floor	Two-leg	>8	Crate	2533 [1]
Floor	Two-leg	>8	Module	5333 [1]
Multi-tier or aviary	Two-leg	>8	Module	2000 [1]

(c) Layer breeder

Housing system	Catch method	Catch team size	Transport container	Process	Birds per hour [Number of responses]
Flat-deck	Two-leg	>8	Module	Depopulation	3000 [2]

(d) Meat chicken (broiler)

Housing system	Catch method	Catch team size	Transport container	Process	Birds per hour [Number of responses]
Floor	One-leg	4	Module	Depopulation	4000-6000 [2]
Floor	One-leg	5	Module	Thinning	6560-7200 [2]
Floor	One-leg	5	Module	Depopulation	4800-5122 [2]
Floor	Two-leg	5	Module	Depopulation	1250 [1]
Floor	Two-leg	6	Module	Depopulation	2857 [1]
Floor	Two-leg	7	Module	Depopulation	5000 [1]
Floor	Mechanical	5	Module	Depopulation	4800 [1]

(e) Broiler breeder

Housing system	Catch method	Catch team size	Transport container	Process	Birds per hour [Number of responses]
Floor	One-leg	7	Module	Depopulation	2900 [1]
Floor	Two-leg	7	Module	Transfer	2900 [1]
Floor	Two-leg	7	Module	Depopulation	2750 [1]
Floor	Body	4	Crate	Depopulation	800 [1]
Flat-deck	Two-leg	>8	Module	Depopulation	1848 [1]

(f) Turkey

Housing system	Catch method	Catch team size	Transport container	Birds per hour [Number of responses]
Floor	Two-leg	5	Module	750 [1]

Optimum staffing and pay

Q14. What is the optimum number of staff members for a standard catching team? Please indicate how this might vary with catching method, flock size, sector, and housing system

A range of information, with varying levels of detail, was submitted. A summary of this open-ended question is provided, below.

Table 8: Responses to the open question regarding the optimum size for a catching team. To standardise the information, flock size has been divided by the number of catchers in a team to calculate the number of birds per catcher.

Sector	System	Optimum catch team size [Number of responses]	Birds per catcher [Number of responses]	Other variables
Laying hens	Not specified	6-16 [4]	200 - 250 [1]	Not specified
Laying hens	Colony	16-25 [2]	1267 [1]	Not specified
Laying hens	Flat-deck	8-25 [2]	1267 [1]	Not specified
Laying hens	Multi-tier or aviary	11-12 [1]	2667 - 2909 [1]	Not specified
Pullet	Not specified	6-30 [3]	Not specified	Not specified
Meat chicken	Floor	4-16 [3]	2500 [1]	Not specified
Meat chicken	Floor	4-5 [1]	Not specified	1-leg
Meat chicken	Floor	6 [1]	Not specified	2-leg
Meat chicken	Floor	5 [1]	Not specified	Mechanical
Meat chicken	Floor	4 [1]	2000 [1]	Mobile housing
Broiler breeder	Not specified	5-6 [1]	Not specified	Transfer
Broiler breeder	Not specified	3-14 [3]	1320 [1]	Depopulation
Turkey	Not specified	4-8 [2]	300 [1]	Not specified

Respondents reported several factors that influenced the optimum size of the catch team, these included:

- the number of available farm staff
- weather conditions
- the breed of the bird
- the length of the onward journey
- shed design (especially the ability to get crates or modules close to the birds)

Q15. How are poultry catcher or handler staff paid?

Table 9: Responses to the closed question regarding how poultry catcher or handler staff are paid. Only those who catch chickens were asked this question (as indicated in response to question 10). The responses add up to more than 19 as several respondents selected more than one answer.

Response	Total
Not answered	3
Hourly rate	8
Annual salary	3
Piece rate per bird	5
Other	3

Respondents confirmed that poultry catcher or handler staff could be paid in several different ways. The most common form of payment reported, selected by 8 out of the 19 respondents that catch chickens, was an hourly rate. Less frequently used methods included payment of a piece rate per bird (5 responses) and via an annual salary (3 responses).

'Other' forms of payment, selected by 3 out of the 19 respondents, included a day rate with over-time payments (1 response), while an NGO that rehomes laying hens just pays fuel expenses to their network of volunteers (1 response).

Q16. What is the average rate of pay for a poultry catcher or handler?

Table 10: Responses to the open question regarding the average rate of pay for a poultry catcher or handler.

Response	Amount	Responses
Hourly rate	£12.20 to £15.20	8
Annual salary	£31,200 to £50,000	3
Piece rate per bird	No information provided	0

Of those 19 respondents that catch chickens, 8 provided hourly rates of pay for a poultry catcher or handler. These ranged between £12.20 and £15.20 and averaged £13.93 per hour. Three respondents supplied an estimate for an annual salary, and these ranged between £31,200 and £50,000. No information relating to piece rate payments per bird was provided.

One respondent explained that travel and work time is paid at the same hourly rate and begins from the time that the catching team gets onto the minibus. They also stated that, due to the location of the poultry units, payment for time spent travelling can make up a significant proportion of the money received.

Welfare outcomes

Q17a. Do you record, or have access to, data on bird welfare outcomes associated with catching? For example, trappings, dead-on-arrival at abattoir, carcase damage (bruising, broken bones, rejections), etc.

All 19 out of the 103 respondents that are actively involved with catching chickens (as indicated in response to question 9) also record, or have access to, data on bird welfare outcomes associated with catching. The other 84 respondents either responded 'no' or chose not to answer this question.

Table 11: Responses to the closed question asking whether the respondent has access to welfare outcomes data associated with catching.

Response	Total	Percent
Yes	19	18%
No	51	50%
Not answered	33	32%

Q17b. If yes, please provide any information you can

Summary of the key themes for the open-ended question 17b:

Only 2 out of the 19 respondents (11%) that record, or have access to, data relating to 'bird welfare outcomes specifically associated with catching' submitted actual data. Most simply listed the type of information that they monitor.

The first response provided 12 months data for meat chickens caught by one-leg, as follows: dead on arrival (DOA) = 0.08%, bruising = 0.01%, traps = 0.001%, lairage reject = 0.007%, leg breaks = 0.001%, wing breaks = 0.06%.

The second response provided data associated with 30,000 laying hens caught by two-legs from a multi-tier or aviary system, as follows: DOA = 0.03%, 0.10% injuries.

Several respondents highlighted that welfare outcomes data recorded at the processing plant may not necessarily be an indicator of poor handling or catching. The health and behaviour of the flock pre-catching, weather, transport, and subsequent processing were all mentioned as potential factors that could influence welfare outcomes.

It was noted that, due to the difficulty in assessing catching damage in feathered birds, carcase damage is often measured after scalding and defeathering. However, carcass damage (including bruising and breakages) may occur during post-slaughter processing operations.

The Consultation Impact Assessment

Q18a. Do you have any comments on the consultation impact assessment and its methodology?

Twenty eight out of the 103 respondents (27%) indicated that they had comments on the consultation impact assessment. The remaining 75 respondents (73%) either responded 'no' or chose not to answer this question.

Table 12: Responses to the closed question asking whether the respondent has comments on the impact assessment.

Response	Total	Percent
Yes	28	27%
No	43	42%
Not answered	32	31%

Q18b. If yes, please provide any information you can to support your view

Summary of the key themes for the open-ended question 18b:

Lack of consideration for human impact

Out of those respondents that replied 'yes' to the previous question, most considered the absence of any consideration for the likely impact of catch method on the health and safety of the catching teams as a key omission.

Specific points raised included:

- two-leg and body-catching was less ergonomic than one-leg catching
- a greater risk of human injury directly associated with catching and handling birds with both hands when working at height (for example, in multi-tier laying hen housing systems)
- longer hours of physical work (including more journeys back and forth to the modules) would result in greater catcher fatigue
- having more workers present within the same enclosed space with more vehicles and machinery would be particularly hazardous

A collated meat chicken industry response highlighted that a shift to two-leg catching would require an increase in labour effort (in terms of distance covered and number of trips to the modules) of 60% during depopulation at the end of the grow-out cycle, and 100% during the practice of thinning.

Under-estimation of costs

Another key theme was a conviction that the assessment had under-estimated costs associated with the two-leg and upright catch methods. This was primarily thought to be due to an underestimation of catch times. Specific points of contention included:

- the use of data from European studies and an absence of robust data from commercial British production systems

- the estimated catch times for both meat chickens and laying hens used in the assessment being shorter than those recorded in recently published Belgian studies (see Delanglez et al., 2024; Delanglez et al., 2025)
- an absence of data specific to laying hens and, consequently, broad assumptions being made across sectors due to the use of just meat chicken data
- a lack of consideration for the wide variety of housing systems, including mobile, flat deck and multi-tier. Each will have a different level of accessibility and, consequently, different handling distances and loading times

Several responses mentioned a failure to include the handling of birds during unloading at the destination (for example, in the case of pullets, at the laying unit), which would further impact the cost of transitioning to a slower method.

A few respondents specifically disagreed with the policy being described as zero cost, due to the wide use of single leg catching. A collated industry response estimated that nearly 90% of all meat chickens and broiler breeders are caught by one-leg for transport to slaughter.

Several collated industry responses highlighted that there are other costs (overheads) in addition to catcher wages that should also be considered. These include the provision of additional equipment and vehicles (plus fuel and insurance), additional non-catching staff (for administration and supervision), and training. They estimate that a full transition of the meat chicken industry from one-leg to two-leg catching would increase their costs by £22.9 million per year, and by £53.2 million to transition to upright catching. These estimates are based on how much more time and resource they expect it will take their teams to keep supplying the processing plants with the same volume using slower catching methods.

Inadequate consideration of direct welfare considerations

Several respondents felt that the assessment placed disproportionate weight on financial considerations (such as cost and catch times) compared to non-financial considerations (such as animal welfare outcomes).

These respondents acknowledged that although welfare harms associated with leg-catching, including injury, stress, pain, and mortality, are conceded within the assessment, they are not robustly factored into the cost-benefit framework. They argued that there is clear scientific evidence that upright catching provides a highly significant non-monetised benefit for chicken welfare. On this basis, they disagreed with the statement ‘there is an absence of evidence that catching by the legs is not acceptable’.

One NGO stakeholder was of the opinion that, due to a relatively small financial cost difference between two-leg and upright catching (£2.7 million, or an equivalent of 0.2 pence per bird, as estimated by the impact assessment), greater consideration of

Option 2 (changing the GB statutory guidance to be in line with the legislation) should have been included.

Omission of unintentional risks to bird welfare

There were repeated concerns that the assessment failed to adequately consider additional risks to bird welfare that could arise following a move to upright catching. Specific examples given included:

- in a situation where more personnel could not be provided, there was concern that longer catch times would increase the birds' exposure to other stressors, such as the duration of feed and water restriction (especially in laying hens as they are often transported over longer distances)
- a greater risk of thermal stress (in overly warm or cold conditions) associated with extended periods without lorry movement, or the ability to close the curtains
- the potential for worker fatigue to negatively impact bird welfare
- the potential for increased keel bone damage, due to greater disturbance, generated by more catchers within the shed, making more journeys to and from the modules
- a greater risk of smother events (for the same reason)

Smothering is an adverse behavioural phenomenon that occurs when birds panic and crowd together in the corner of buildings, sometimes leading to suffocation and high mortality.

Other responses

A collated industry response highlighted that the government has a growth agenda, yet the assessment did not consider the impact of the policy proposal on growth. They raised the concern that if catching became too expensive there would be a risk that locally produced poultry products would be replaced by imported lower welfare products from outside of Great Britain.

An NGO stakeholder raised an issue linked to enviro-sustainability that was not considered in the assessment. As slower methods extend the time to fill a transport vehicle, it will be necessary to utilise a larger catching team or use a larger number of transport vehicles to ensure that the within-crate time is minimised. Increasing the number of vehicles used to transport catching staff to farms, or poultry to their onward destination, would potentially have a negative environmental impact.

Catching turkeys

Q19. Do you or your organisation catch turkeys (under 10kg) for loading and unloading operations?

Table 13: Responses to the closed question asking whether the respondent or their organisation catches turkeys.

Response	Total	Percent
Yes	5	5%
No	76	74%
Not answered	22	21%

Only 5 out of the 103 respondents (5%) indicated that they catch turkeys (under 10kg) for loading and unloading operations. This included collated responses from industry. The remaining 98 respondents (95%) either responded ‘no’ or chose not to answer this question.

The following question (Q20) was only answered by respondents that do catch turkeys.

Q20. Which of the following methods do you use to catch turkeys (under 10 kg) for the purpose of loading and unloading?

Table 14: Responses to the closed question asking which methods are used to catch turkeys. The responses add up to more than 5 (the number of responses that answered ‘yes’ to question 19) as several respondents selected more than one answer.

Response	Total
2-leg	4
Body	3
Other	2
Prefer not to say	0

Of those 5 respondents that indicated that they caught turkeys (under 10kg), 4 out of 5 claimed to catch by two legs, 3 out of 5 by the body, and 2 out of 5 use an ‘other’ method.

A collated industry response provided information on the methods routinely used to catch, lift and carry turkeys within various weight ranges (table 15). This is largely aligned with RSPCA-Assured standards, which were also provided.

Table 15: Information (submitted as part of a collated industry response) relating to handling methods routinely used with turkeys, according to the weight of the bird.

Bird weight	Handling method	Orientation
Less than 2kg	Both legs with no more than 3 birds in each hand	Inverted
2kg to 5kg	Both legs with no more than 1 bird in each hand	Inverted
5kg to 8kg	Individually, by grasping the shoulder of the wing furthest away from the catcher, whilst using the other hand to hold both legs. Lifted and held close to the catcher's body. Outside wing catching: two birds are loaded at the same time by the outside wing knuckle joint, holding the inner wing together supporting their body weight.	Upright
More than 8kg	Individually by grasping the shoulder of the wing furthest away from the catcher, whilst using the other hand to hold the closest leg. Lifted and held close to the catcher's body.	Upright

An individual respondent confirmed that, under 10kg, birds were caught, lifted and carried by either both legs (one per hand), rugby ball style (both hands) or by a combination of one leg and one wing (one bird at a time). Whereas birds over 10kg were exclusively caught, lifted and carried by one leg and one wing (one bird at a time) or herded.

Q21a. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statement: 'It should be legally permissible to catch turkeys (under 10kg) by two legs for the purpose of loading and unloading'?

Most respondents (55 out of 103, 53%) claimed to 'strongly disagree' with the proposal that it should be legally permissible to catch turkeys (under 10 kg) by two legs for the purpose of loading and unloading. The stakeholder breakdown for this response was as follows:

- General public = 36 responses (of which 29 were part of a campaign response)
- NGOs = 12 responses
- Academics = 4 responses
- Local authorities = 2 responses
- Poultry industry = 1 response

The next most popular response was ‘strongly agree’ (13 out of 103, 13%). The stakeholder breakdown for this response was as follows:

- Poultry industry = 9 responses
- General public = 2 responses
- Academic = 1 response
- NGO = 1 response

Table 16: Responses to the closed question asking respondents to what extent they agree or disagree with the statement: ‘It should be legally permissible to catch turkeys (under 10kg) by two legs for the purpose of loading and unloading’

Response	Total	Percent
Strongly agree	13	13%
Agree	6	6%
Neutral	2	2%
Disagree	6	6%
Strongly disagree	55	53%
Don’t know	9	9%
Not answered	12	12%

The other main responses logged were ‘Don’t know’ (9 responses, 9%). ‘Agree’ (6 responses, 6%), and ‘Disagree’ (6 responses, 6%). Twelve out of the 103 respondents declined to answer (12%).

Q21b. Please provide any information you can to support your answer, including any information relating to the welfare of turkeys during, or after, two-leg catching

Summary of the key themes for the open-ended question 21b:

Those not in support

Most of those respondents that were not in agreement with the statement (Q21a) considered the catching of turkeys by two legs to be detrimental to welfare, or to be less welfare appropriate than upright catching methods. The campaign response recommended upright carrying as the preferred method as it did not require the birds to be inverted and would reduce the risk of pain and injury.

Some responses considered turkeys with ‘a body mass of up to 10kg’ as being too heavy to lift solely by the legs. It was recognised that there is a need for more research in this area as, to date, there have been very few studies on the impact of catching methods on turkey welfare. Respondents predicted that welfare challenges associated with inversion, such as increased pressure on the joints, heart, and

respiratory system (which could lead to pain, injury, and breathing difficulties), would increase with bird weight.

A specific welfare concern mentioned was the potential difficulty in ensuring the safe transferral of a bird of this size into upper drawers, whilst maintaining good control of the wings, neck and head to prevent trauma.

Several respondents suggested that any maximum weight specified, under which two-leg catching be permitted, should correlate with existing weight limits associated with neck dislocation in poultry.

An NGO stakeholder recommended caution when creating future legislation, to ensure that the wing-and-leg catching techniques that are currently considered to be best practice for lifting heavy turkeys, are not inadvertently prohibited.

Those in support

The key view of those that either ‘agreed’, or ‘strongly agreed’, that turkeys should be permitted to be caught by two legs was that two-leg catching is not detrimental for turkey welfare. Respondents confirmed that two-leg catching is routinely used in turkey ‘brood and move’ production systems, where young birds are routinely moved (either within the same farm or to a grow-out farm) at 4 to 6 weeks, when they are still relatively light.

It was also highlighted that turkeys are routinely caught and held by two legs when they are vaccinated and during artificial insemination, although they are only inverted for a short period of time during these procedures.

Several respondents mentioned speed and cost. Concern was expressed that a move from a two-leg to a rugby ball catch method for small birds reared as part of brood and move operations would considerably slow the catch.

Views on future research

Q22. We intend to commission research in response to the AWC's recommendation, that additional data on the relationship between different manual catching methods and welfare outcomes be gathered and analysed. Please provide any views you may have on how robust data of this kind could best be generated

Summary of the key themes for the open-ended question 22:

Most responses recommended the collection of a full range of clearly defined welfare metrics on farm and at the processing plant, including injury rates (such as fractures, bruises and dislocations), behavioural and physiological indicators of stress

(including corticosterone levels, vocalisations, escape attempts and tonic immobility), and mortality data.

Many responses stressed the need to carry out the research on commercial systems and at scale (rather than utilising a research facility). There were also recommendations that as many different production systems, housing types and practices should be incorporated as possible, to account for the variability in housing complexity and bird size (smaller meat chickens are caught during the practice of thinning).

A popular theme was consistency of training. Respondents highlighted the importance of using fully trained (and experienced) industry catching teams and also suggested that the research project could be used to develop catch methods for use in training programmes.

A few responses specifically mentioned the need to collect data on the best methods to catch and move turkeys, and for this to be used in the development of evidence-based guidance to clarify which manual handling methods should be permissible for use with specific weight brackets.

Other themes identified included:

- the need to incorporate the assessment of catching team health and safety within the study design
- the need to standardise as many factors as possible, including breed and weight as well as other potential confounds, such as ‘farm’ or ‘processing plant’. Specific suggestions included, using different catch methods within the same flock, and attempting to limit variability in ‘catching damage’ (a measure of carcase damage after transport, slaughter, scalding and defeathering) by using the same abattoir
- the recommendation to involve independent experts in animal welfare to oversee the research (to ensure impartiality and reduce the risk of commercial bias)

The sector trade bodies were keen that they, and other poultry stakeholders from across the supply chain, should be directly involved in this research going forwards, due to the support they can offer and their detailed understandings of the various industries.

Several respondents highlighted the existence of additional relevant data sets currently being generated by various EU projects and stressed the value of shared learning.

Other recommendations included the calculation of additional costs associated with different catch times, to include one-leg catching as one of the test methods, to limit

the study only to non-leg catching techniques, and to publish the resulting data to ensure full transparency.

Any further considerations

Q23. Please provide any further considerations that you feel should be noted regarding the policy proposal to amend Regulation 1/2005 (for example, barriers to recruitment)

Summary of the key themes for the open-ended question 23:

As already reported in question 9, most respondents indicated that they were not in favour of changing the legislation. Instead, their preference would be for the government to adopt Option 2 (the non-legislative alternative, as set out in the impact assessment). This option would require an amendment to the GB statutory guidance to reflect the prohibition on the lifting of animals by their legs, as per Regulation 1/2005, and require chickens to be caught and carried upright by their bodies.

Most of the submissions that disagreed with our proposals included text identifiable as a campaign response. Welfare concerns linked to inversion, associated with lifting by the legs, were most frequently cited as the reason for this preference, and this was based upon published scientific literature and the 2024 Animal Welfare Committee (AWC) opinion on the welfare implications of different methods and systems for the catching carrying collecting and loading of poultry.

The campaign response recognised that catching chickens by two legs is better for their welfare than using just one leg, as lifting and carrying by one leg increases the risk of injuries like fractures, dislocations and bruising, while lifting by two legs spreads the weight being supported by each joint.

The campaign response also recognised that the poultry industries would face a significant challenge in moving away from one-leg catching. This meant that most responses recorded as not being in favour of Option 1, the proposal to amend the legislation to permit two-leg catching of chickens (as set out in the impact assessment), also agreed that Option 1 could form an acceptable interim step. Such a transition would, however, only be considered acceptable if it led to the full implementation of Option 2 after 5 years.

The campaign response suggested that such a transition period would allow the poultry industry sufficient time to adapt their operational systems, train workers in safe upright handling techniques, invest in necessary equipment changes, and support further research into alternative catching methods. It would also enable the collection of additional data on the welfare impacts of different carrying techniques and ensure a robust evidence base for future improvements.

Further recommendations of the campaign response were as follows:

- to use Animal Transport Certificates to capture information on ‘catch method employed’ for use in monitoring and enforcement
- to utilise digital record systems to monitor how many birds are culled on farms due to catching, carrying, and loading practices

A broad range of other themes emerged from the collated industry and individual responses. These will now be considered, in turn.

Improved housing design

The need for improved housing design, and investment in better equipment and mechanisation to reduce manual carrying time was repeatedly highlighted, particularly in respect to facilitating upright catching. Specific points raised included:

- the lack of practical consideration for the catching process in the design of modern multi-tier (aviary) systems
- only a small proportion of British meat chicken housing currently being suitable to accommodate large mechanical catching machinery
- a potential requirement to drastically modify existing housing to enable two catching teams (with their own designated forklifts) to work in the same shed at the same time

Training

Respondents often stressed the need for industry to receive better training in alternate catching methods. Some of these felt that there was a primary need to develop (potentially via commissioned research) effective methods of (two-leg and upright body) catching that suited each specific sector and housing system. Specific responses linked in with other themes, but the key focus was to ensure quality of bird handling (to protect bird welfare) and to protect the health and safety of the catchers themselves.

Unintended bird welfare issues

Several respondents expressed concern that a move to a slower catch method (such as two-leg or upright catching) could create additional ‘unintentional’ welfare issues due to increased catch times. Such issues have already been mentioned as a potential omission from the impact assessment. Specific examples provided include: an increased risk of smothers and keel fractures, temperature stress, and the danger that feed withdrawal limits may be exceeded. One respondent reported that increased catch times have been associated with increased injury, DOAs and stress.

Catcher fatigue was also specifically highlighted. It was suggested that the transition to a more physically strenuous catch method could negatively compromise both bird

and human welfare, as an increase in tiredness and fatigue amongst the catching team could increase the likelihood of mistakes, and subsequent injuries, occurring.

Occupational risk

Several responses considered there to be a need to review occupational risks associated with two-leg and upright catching, and this fell into two broad themes. The first, as already mentioned in question 10, was that some catching techniques are more ergonomically and physically demanding for the catchers themselves. The second point raised was the potential for serious health and safety issues caused by having more people working for longer hours in an enclosed space where machinery is operating.

A collated industry response described the current baseline as already including multiple catching teams on a site, plus contractors to muck out and clean, farm staff, plant machinery operators and van drivers. This went on to highlight that a further increase in people would be challenging in terms of managing site traffic and could, potentially, cause a hazardous situation. The solution suggested would require the modification of housing to enable two catching teams to work in parallel, within the same shed at the same time. This would be expensive and require investment in infrastructure (subject to planning constraints) and additional equipment such as forklifts and vehicles.

Labour shortages

There were repeated concerns regarding labour availability. Collated industry responses warned that there was a pressing need to address labour shortages and recruitment issues to avoid creating additional welfare issues and to maintain food security.

Industry respondents described poultry catching as a highly skilled and physically difficult job (often carried out at night) and confirmed that catching teams are currently in short supply across Great Britain due to recruitment issues. Few British nationals are willing to do the work. They explained that the sector traditionally relied heavily upon migrant workers to carry out the role, but immigration policies post-Brexit have reduced this labour supply. The current situation regarding Avian Influenza has also increased existing demand for catching teams.

A recurring concern was that unintended welfare consequences associated with longer catch, crate and waiting times could be further exacerbated by the shortage of poultry catchers. Industry stakeholders highlighted that by making the job physically harder it could become seen as even less attractive work. Not only would this make it more difficult for catching companies to retain existing staff, but it could also create a greater barrier for recruitment. Respondents were concerned that this could reduce the skill base, in turn reducing the quality of catching and, potentially, impacting bird welfare.

Industry stakeholders explained that catching teams are required to work to tight timelines. These are carefully managed to ensure that the meat chicken processing plants receive the correct volume of birds to maintain the required production output. They highlighted that any problem with labour availability could, very quickly, lead to welfare issues on farm due to overstocking as well as impacting food availability for the consumer.

A suggestion was made that workforce development could potentially be supported by a government scheme.

Impact of additional cost

Several respondents expressed concern that the financial cost of moving from one-leg to two-leg catching could threaten national food security and encourage the import of egg and chicken products from other countries with lower animal welfare, food safety and environmental standards than Great Britain.

One collated industry response estimated that a move to two-leg catching would increase catch costs by up to 100%. The additional costs would be due to a combination of increased labour requirements to support a slower catch method (assuming the extra workforce could be found), potential modifications to housing and infrastructure, and a requirement for additional equipment and vehicles.

Respondents warned that domestic production could be directly impacted if increased costs made some businesses unviable. There was also concern that increased costs in the domestic supply chain would be reflected in shelf prices.

Compliance

Some responses, submitted by local authorities, highlighted a need for better compliance and regulatory control. Mandating body-worn cameras for catching teams, or for compulsory on-farm CCTV, were raised as potential options.

Government response and next steps

Animal welfare is a devolved policy area. This policy statement is a joint statement by the UK, Welsh and Scottish governments.

We are grateful to all those who took the time to respond to the consultation. We have noted the range of responses. The consultation has raised some important considerations around how poultry catching policy operates and has helped inform our desired direction of travel.

The consultation sought views on our proposals to provide clarity on the permitted methods of catching chickens during transport operations pending further research

in this area. It also sought views on whether those proposals should apply to turkeys within a weight range. Two regulatory options, Option 1 (amend Regulation 1/2005 to expressly allow chickens to be caught by both legs) and Option 2 (amend the GB statutory guidance to stop catching chickens by the legs and require catching by the body) were included. These would ensure consistency between the legal requirements in Regulation 1/2005 and the GB statutory guidance and provide certainty regarding the welfare protection for chickens and turkeys during catching operations in connection with their transportation. The Consultation on poultry catching and handling explained why the UK, Welsh and Scottish governments considered Option 1 to be preferable to Option 2. Following our review of the consultation responses, we consider that Option 1 is still the most appropriate option to ensure consistency between Regulation 1/2005 and the GB statutory guidance, to provide certainty on permitted methods of catching chickens and turkeys by the legs.

We recognise that there is much evidence to suggest that upright catching by the body is the optimum handling method to directly minimise welfare harms. However, in their 2024 Opinion, AWC state: “From a welfare viewpoint, upright catching and carrying are likely to be preferable to catching by the legs and carrying inverted providing that, in the situation in question, welfare gains are not offset by welfare harms resulting from increased catching, carrying, loading and waiting durations”. They also report “…the method that is likely to deliver higher welfare for an individual chicken will depend on factors related to the bird, its accommodation and the weather that include: flock type (broiler or layer), breed, flock age, the body conformation of the individual bird, the physical strength of the legs of the individual bird, shed construction, shed furnishings, shed layout, catching personnel, ambient outdoor temperature and outdoor humidity”. On this basis they conclude that “Because of the multiple variables to consider in any specific catching, carrying and loading situation, AWC is unable to specify a single method that will deliver higher bird welfare in every circumstance.”

The consultation responses have confirmed our initial assessment, that mandating a transition to upright catching would not be appropriate without first obtaining a full and accurate understanding of the overall welfare and cost implications, and the feasibility of doing so under GB commercial settings. Without this understanding, we cannot be confident that the British egg and meat chicken industries would be able to make a comprehensive transition to upright catching in a manner that would deliver an overall improvement in bird welfare at this time.

To address the gaps in the scientific evidence, Defra has commissioned a research project to study the impact of various catching methods (including two-leg and upright) with relevance to our national meat chicken, laying hen and turkey sectors and the different housing systems prevalent within Great Britain. This research will provide an opportunity for animal welfare scientists to work with experienced catch teams to develop catch methods appropriate for use with different species and types

of housing infrastructure. It will also provide an opportunity to record catch timings, costings, and welfare metrics relevant to our poultry industries for use in the assessment of which methods, within scope of the project, can consistently deliver the best cumulative welfare outcomes. This will be crucial to inform future policy on catching methods. We are very grateful to those industry stakeholders that have offered their assistance in this matter to allow this research to be taken forward.

It is hoped that the outputs of this research will be available within the next 5 years. This new data will be used to consider whether a transition to upright catching in Great Britain would deliver overall improvements in animal welfare outcomes, whilst maintaining production and protecting food security and the health and safety of the workforce in the sector.

The impact assessment has been updated using information provided as part of this consultation. This information has helped to verify assumptions such as wages and current practice estimates and highlight where assumptions could be improved, such as time estimates for enriched colony cage laying hens. Responses from industry stakeholders indicate that their assessment of the impacts of the proposed amendment are higher than those in the impact assessment, especially for upright catch methods.

There has been a recent shift in egg producers moving from colony cage production to higher welfare multi-tier (aviary) barn systems. We believe that upright catching does not currently suit the taller multi-tier systems as catchers can struggle to safely access and remove the birds. It is hoped that the research project, in combination with this consultation and the proposed legislative amendments, will help to progress this issue and encourage aviary manufacturers to consider how future system designs can better accommodate the catch team at depopulation.

The consultation also confirmed that the broiler industry in Great Britain is currently primarily dependent upon manual catching due to the use of mechanised catching systems being limited by existing housing infrastructure. We are hopeful that a recent commitment by multiple supermarkets to support the production of meat chickens at 30kg/m^2 should provide the industry with an opportunity to invest in additional modern housing suitable for use with these mechanised systems.

We also sought views on whether Option 1 should include a similar exemption for turkeys under a certain weight. Some respondents considered that turkeys weighing up to 10kg were too heavy to be inverted and carried by two legs. Information provided by industry stakeholders indicated that only turkeys weighing 5kg, or less, are caught by two legs, while turkeys weighing more than 5kg are caught upright. In some production systems turkeys between 4 to 6 weeks are routinely caught by two legs, while established best-practice methods include lifting larger (heavier) birds with two hands (rugby ball style) or by a combination of a leg and a shoulder.

Defra's welfare code for turkeys does not currently include advice on the method by which turkeys should be caught, lifted and carried. Scotland and Wales do not have equivalent statutory guidance. However, to ensure a consistent approach between chickens and turkeys, we consider that it is appropriate, for the time being, to allow turkeys weighing 5kg, or less, to continue to be caught, lifted and carried by two legs. We recognise the need to ensure that any legislative baseline for turkeys does not preclude established best practice methods of handling larger birds upright by a combination of a leg and a shoulder.

Whilst the scientific literature on catching methods is clear that two-leg catching poses greater welfare risks when compared with upright catching, we consider that there is sufficient evidence that two-leg catching remains a minimum acceptable standard, as careful handling will reduce those risks. We are confident that when loading or unloading birds, arrangements will, in practice, be made to minimise the duration that birds are handled inverted as it will remain in the best interest of the catching team to ensure that the crates and modules are placed as close to the birds as possible. Maintaining multiple birds per hand will provide some support to the body to help in minimising the risk of injury during inversion.

The responses from the industry clearly highlight the potential costs of a transition from one-leg to two-leg catching. However, we remain firmly of the view, as set out in the GB statutory guidance, that one-leg catching is not an acceptable catch method for poultry. It has been clear for more than 20 years that this technique is not welfare appropriate, as it increases the risk of birds sustaining leg fractures and dislocated femurs during the catching process. The GB statutory guidance was last updated following a consultation in 2018. Both the 2022 European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) report 'Welfare of domestic birds and rabbits transported in containers' and the 2024 AWC Opinion confirm that one-leg catching is not appropriate due to the welfare risks associated with this method.

To remove the discrepancy between the legislation and the established GB statutory guidance, Defra and the Scottish and Welsh Governments will proceed with their proposal to amend point 1.8 of Chapter III of Annex 1 to Regulation 1/2005 to exempt chickens from the prohibition on the lifting of chickens by their legs. The exemption will also be extended to turkeys. This will allow chickens and turkeys to be caught, lifted and carried by two legs for the purpose of transport related operations in England, Scotland and Wales.

The amendment will further make it clear that when chickens, and turkeys weighing 5kg or less, are caught by the legs, they must be caught by two legs. In the case of turkeys weighing more than 5kg, we will make it clear that they cannot be lifted and carried in an inverted position by their legs. This will provide the egg, meat chicken and turkey industries, and their associated catching companies, with clarity on the legal requirements that apply to the catching of poultry during transport operations.

We recognise that some respondents, especially those associated with the campaign response, will be disappointed that we will not be requiring the poultry industry to transition to upright catching at this time. This is not a weakening of the welfare standards in practice, as until more recently Regulation 1/2005 had not been understood to require chickens to be caught upright and the GB statutory guidance was therefore intended to specify the permitted methods of catching.

We will continue to work with APHA regarding monitoring procedures and enforcement to ensure that those catching chickens are compliant with the legislation.