



SUMMARY REPORT POLAND

Improving the reporting on the implementation of Directive 2010/63/EU on the protection of animals used for scientific purposes

Under Article 54(1) of Directive 2010/63/EU (the Directive), Member States are required to submit to the European Commission (EC) information on the implementation of this Directive once every 5 years. Reports covering the first five years of the functioning of the Directive, i.e. the period 2013-2017, were submitted by EU Member States to the EC in 2018. Reporting requirements for this first submission of information on the implementation of the Directive were set out in Annex I of Commission Implementing Decision 2012/707/EU.

The second submission of information on the implementation of the Directive will cover the years 2018-2022, and is due to be submitted by the Member States to the EC by 10 November 2023. The reporting requirements for this second submission are set out in Annex II of Commission Implementing Decision 2020/569/EU, replacing Commission Implementing Decision 2012/707/EU.

Based on the answers provided by Poland and other Member States to the EC 2018 survey on the implementation of the Directive, the present summary report provides the following information: **blue check marks** (✔) correspond to elements that were adequately reported by Poland, **red crosses** (✘) correspond to elements that were required by Commission Implementing Decision 2012/707/EU, but were not adequately reported by Poland, and **yellow**

crosses (⚠) correspond to elements that were not explicitly required by law, but were reported by other Member States or requested by the EC to help clarify any concerns from users and other stakeholders.

In line with this analysis, this report provides recommendations that can improve Poland's reporting on the implementation of the Directive. A better and more harmonised reporting by Member States will further increase transparency and openness, and will enable the assessment of the effectiveness of the implementation of the Directive among all Member States.

Our recommendations are based on the new reporting requirements set out in the sections of Annex II of Commission Implementing Decision 2020/569/EU, and on best practices among the replies of the Member States to the EC 2018 survey on the implementation of the Directive. Accordingly, our recommendations are divided into two subsections: **legal requirements** and **best practices**. Recommendations under legal requirements will be preceded by a **warning sign** (⚠) for elements that were adequately reported, but where supplementary information is now required by the new Commission Implementing Decision 2020/569/EU.



Competent Authorities

- ✓ Information on the framework for competent authorities, including the numbers and types of authorities as well as their respective tasks was reported. However, it would be helpful if Poland could provide an organogram or other explanatory document translated in English to better understand the functioning of the competent authorities.
- ✗ Poland did not explain how the different competent authorities interact to ensure that the Directive is implemented effectively.

Recommendations

Section B-1

Best practices

Explain how the different **competent authorities interact** to ensure that the Directive is implemented effectively, including what **measures are in place to ensure a coherent approach and consistency of outcomes** (e.g. use of standardised forms; regular meetings, training).

Provide an **organogram or other explanatory document translated in English** to better understand the functioning of the competent authorities.

National Committee

- ✓ Information on the structure of the National Committee was reported.
- ✓ General information on the expertise of the members was reported.
- ✓ Information on the National Committee's task to advise animal welfare bodies was reported.
- ✓ Information on the National Committee's task to share best practice was reported.
- ✗ Poland did not specify whether the members of the National Committee possess expertise in the field of the 3Rs.
- ✗ Information on how the National Committee aims to address coherent approach to project evaluation, and review strategies at national level was missing.
- ✗ The web-address(es) to the documents and recommendations published by the National Committee were not specified.

Recommendations

Section B-2

Best practices

Provide information on how the National Committee aims to address **coherent approach to project evaluation, and review strategies at national level** as provided in Recital 48 (e.g. drawing up common templates).

Recommendations continued

Specify whether the members of the National Committee possess **expertise in the field of the 3Rs**, and whether they **attend training courses related to project evaluation** to provide appropriate advice on this topic, and in particular regarding the 3Rs and the use of procedures that respect the physiological and behavioural needs of animals as much as possible; cause a minimum level of pain and suffering; and use adequate research models, particularly alternative methods.

Provide the **web-address(es) where the recommendations and guides** published by the National Committee can be found, if applicable.



Animal welfare bodies

- ✓ Information on the structure of animal welfare bodies was reported.
- ✓ Poland reported that there are no additional permanent members beyond those listed in Article 26(2).
- ✓ The aspects of the work of animal welfare bodies that function well and that could be improved were reported.
- ✗ Information on the measures implemented to ensure that members possess the expertise needed to advise the staff, and whether animal welfare bodies are subject to controls was missing.
- ✗ Information on the functioning of animal welfare bodies was missing.

Recommendations

Section C-4

Legal requirements

Explain the measures taken to ensure compliance with the following requirements regarding the **functioning of animal welfare bodies of Articles 26 and 27** of the Directive:

- Member States shall ensure that **each breeder, supplier and user** sets up an animal-welfare body;
- the animal welfare body shall also receive input from the **designated veterinarian** or the expert referred to in Article 25;
- the animal welfare body shall, as a minimum, **carry out the following tasks**: (a) advise the staff dealing with animals on matters related to the welfare of animals, in relation to their acquisition, accommodation, care and use; (b) advise the staff on the application of the requirement of replacement, reduction and refinement, and keep it informed of technical and scientific developments in these fields; (c) establish and review internal operational processes regarding monitoring, reporting and follow-up in relation to the welfare of animals housed or used in the establishment; (d) follow the development and outcome of projects, taking into account the effect on the animals used, and identify and advise on elements that further contribute to replacement, reduction and refinement; and (e) advise on rehoming schemes, including the appropriate socialisation of the animals to be rehomed;
- Member States shall ensure that the **records of any advice given by the animal-welfare body** and decisions taken regarding that advice are kept for at least 3 years.

*Recommendations continued***Best practices**

Report the **measures implemented and/or tools provided** to ensure that members possess the **expertise** needed to advise the staff, and in particular on the application of the requirement of replacement, reduction and refinement (e.g. training; seminars).

Indicate whether animal welfare bodies are **subject to controls during inspections** and, if so, describe the elements that are checked (e.g. reports; composition; monitoring of decisions; follow-up of the implemented projects).

Specify whether concrete measures have been taken since 2018 to **improve the aspects of the work of animal welfare bodies that could be ameliorated**, including whether measures have been taken to establish a simple and easily accessible system of knowledge about emerging alternative methods; further expand the animal rehoming system; and to establish a more efficient mutual exchange of experiences and positive solutions between animal welfare bodies.



Principles of Replacement, Reduction and Refinement (3Rs)

- ✓ Poland reported that the principles of the 3Rs are particularly detailed in the project application forms, and that compliance with the 3Rs is verified during the project evaluation process.
- ✓ Poland reported that the National Committee supports postgraduate studies, conferences and training courses that aim to promote the 3Rs principles.
- ✓ Poland reported that one of the main tasks before agreeing to carry out a specific research project is ensuring that there is no duplication of procedures.
- ✗ Summary information on the data that applicants must address in their application form regarding the 3Rs principles was missing.
- ✗ Poland did not specify the strategies used by the project evaluators to verify the information submitted by an applicant, and decide whether the 3Rs principles are satisfactorily addressed.
- ✗ A voluntary report on the Member State's activities in relation to the development, validation and promotion of alternative approaches at national level was not submitted.

Recommendations

Section D-1.1

Legal requirements

⚠ Provide information on the measures taken to ensure that the **principles of (a) replacement, (b) reduction and (c) refinement are satisfactorily addressed within authorised projects** in accordance with Articles 4 and 13 of the Directive, which state that:

- Member States shall ensure that, wherever possible, a **scientifically satisfactory method** or testing strategy, not entailing the use of live animals, shall be used instead of a procedure;
- Member States shall ensure that the number of animals used in projects is **reduced to a minimum** without compromising the objectives of the project;

Recommendations continued

- Member States shall ensure refinement of breeding, accommodation and care, and of methods used in procedures, **eliminating or reducing to the minimum** any possible pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm to the animals;
- without prejudice to national legislation prohibiting certain types of methods, Member States shall ensure that a procedure is **not carried out if another method** or testing strategy for obtaining the result sought, not entailing the use of a live animal, is recognised under the legislation of the Union;
- in choosing between procedures, those which to the **greatest extent meet the following requirements shall be selected**: (a) use the minimum number of animals; (b) involve animals with the lowest capacity to experience pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm; (c) cause the least pain, suffering, distress or lasting harm; and are most likely to provide satisfactory results;
- **death as the end-point of a procedure shall be avoided** as far as possible and replaced by early and humane end-points. Where death as the end-point is unavoidable, the procedure shall be designed so as to (a) result in the deaths of as few animals as possible; and (b) reduce the duration and intensity of suffering to the animal to the minimum possible and, as far as possible, ensure a painless death.

Best practices

Report the **information related to the 3Rs principles** that applicants need to provide in their application file (e.g. systematic literature search for alternative methods which do not involve the use of live animals; reasons for not using alternative methods when available, relevance of the animal(s) species chosen, use of appropriate statistical methods to calculate the minimal number of animals necessary to obtain scientifically relevant results, explain whether a collaboration with another laboratory is possible to reduce the number of animals used, indicate the methods used to reduce or eliminate the discomfort experienced by the animals, appropriate breeding strategies for animals with genetic modifications which cause harmful phenotypes to minimise the number of animals suffering from such phenotypes, sharing of tissue and organs either within establishments or via biobanks, information about the refinement of the conditions of accommodation and care during the projects, description of the humane end-points that were set).

Indicate the **strategies used by the project evaluators to verify** the information submitted by an applicant, and decide whether the 3Rs principles are satisfactorily addressed (e.g. use of a standardised form or a check-list; review of the application by a statistician; use of common databases to verify whether alternative methods are available or appropriate; by staying informed on the latest technical and scientific developments in these fields).

Section D-1.2

Legal requirements

⚠ Provide information on the measures taken to ensure that the **principles of (a) reduction and (b) refinement are satisfactorily addressed during housing and care** in breeding and supplying establishments in accordance with Article 4 of the Directive.

Examples of best practices

- **Specify whether it is verified that:** (a) the installations and equipment are suited to species of animals housed and to the performance of the procedures that will be carried out; (b) animals are in good health; (c) incompatible species are not housed together; (d) animal health and wellbeing is daily monitored and recorded by a competent person; (e) the transportation is adapted to the species; (f) acclimatisation and quarantine is possible; (g) animals

Recommendations continued

are housed in groups when applicable; (h) animals have sufficient space and can express normal behaviour; (i) enrichment is provided as appropriate to the species; (j) the enclosures are made of non-toxic material and cannot endanger the animals; (k) the animals receive sufficient food and water; (l) bedding material and nesting material is provided and refreshed regularly; (m) the environment is suitable to the species of animals housed including ventilation, temperature, lighting, noise, and relative humidity; (n) albino animals receive special lighting conditions; (o) animals can satisfy their physiological and ethological needs; (p) animals are free of stress, anxiety, thirst, hunger, discomfort, pain, injury, illness or abnormal behaviour, and whether positive emotions are shown including playing behaviour, adaptability to situations, exploration behaviour; (q) alarm systems and active maintenance programs are in place as well as cleaning schedules for installations and equipment; (r) facilities are in place for carrying out diagnostic tests, collection of samples, housing sick animals, performing surgery, post-operative care, and post-mortem examination.

- Provide information on the **role of animal welfare bodies** in ensuring that the principles of the 3Rs are satisfactorily addressed during housing and care (e.g. carry out regular meetings with all persons involved in the project to advise on the implementation of the 3Rs, and verify that the 3Rs are satisfactorily addressed; ensure adequate and continuous education and training of staff).

Section D-2**Legal requirements**

⚠ Explain how **duplication of procedures is avoided to comply with Article 46** of the Directive, which states that **each Member State shall accept data from other Member States** that are generated by procedures recognised by the legislation of the Union, unless further procedures need to be carried out regarding that data for the protection of public health, safety or the environment.

*Recommendations continued***Best practices**

Regarding the **avoidance of duplication**, report:

- the **information that applicants must provide in their application file** (e.g. systematic literature search; the websites, online databases, books and/or journals that were consulted as well as the time period of the search and the keywords that were used, where applicable; exchange with other research groups internally and externally; access to data within the establishment);
- the **strategy used by project evaluators** to check this information.

Section D-1**Best practices**

Submit to the European Commission a **voluntary report** regarding Poland's activities in relation to the **development, validation and promotion of alternative approaches** at national level.



Project Evaluation & Authorisation

- ✓ The processes of project evaluation and authorisation were described.
- ✓ Poland reported that the processes of project evaluation and authorisation have not been published.
- ✓ Poland described how the requirements of Article 38(1) and 38(2) of the Directive are met.
- ✓ The measures taken to integrate the opinion of independent parties were described.
- ✓ Information on how expertise for project evaluation is considered in accordance with Article 38(3) was reported.
- ✗ Poland did not specify whether project applications are discussed and reviewed by animal welfare bodies.
- ✗ Information on the measures taken to ensure that the project evaluators have the required expertise and skills was missing.
- ✗ Poland indicated that the National Committee conducts training for local ethics committees, but detailed information on the training programme was missing.
- ✗ Poland did not explain how the different competent authorities interact and coordinate to ensure consistency and efficiency of the processes.
- ✗ Poland did not describe how the requirements of Article 38(4) of the Directive are met.
- ✗ Poland did not specify how the requirements of Article 40(2) and (3) of the Directive are met.



Recommendations

Section B-4

Legal requirements

Explain the measures taken to **ensure compliance with the requirements of Article 38(4)** of the Directive, which states that the **project evaluation process shall be transparent**.



Examples of best practices

Take measures to ensure transparency if this is not already the case, and report information on these measures. Examples include publication of the reasons for **rejecting project applications**; and timely publication of **non-technical project summaries**, ensuring that they are clearly written, and that they provide all the required information as laid down in the Directive.

Also, since the **identity and profile of project evaluators** are made publicly available by Poland, report the **web-address** where this information can be found.

Explain the measures taken to **ensure compliance with the requirements of Article 40(2) and (3)** of the Directive, which states that:

- the **project authorisation shall specify** the following: (a) the user who undertakes the project; (b) the persons responsible for the overall implementation of the project and its compliance with the project authorisation; (c) the establishments in which the project will be undertaken, where applicable; and (d) any specific conditions following the project evaluation, including whether and when the project shall be assessed retrospectively;
- project authorisations shall be **granted for a period not exceeding 5 years**.

Best practices

Publish the **processes of project evaluation and authorisation**, and specify the web-address where this information can be found.

Specify whether project applications are **discussed and reviewed by animal welfare bodies** before submitting the application to the competent authority responsible for the authorisation of projects.

With regard to the measures taken to **consider expertise for project evaluation**, report:

- information on the **training programme** (e.g. minimum duration; type of modules; training objectives; follow-ups);
- the measures taken to **ensure that the project evaluators have the required expertise and skills** (e.g. providing CVs and justifications of competence to the national competent authority; consultation of documents related to project evaluation by the national competent authority to ensure that the required expertise was present during the evaluation of a project).

Explain how the **different competent authorities interact and coordinate** to ensure consistency and efficiency of the processes (e.g. regular meetings; use of standardised forms).



Retrospective Assessment

- ✓ The number of projects submitted for retrospective assessment was reported in respect of each year.
- ✓ Information on the types of projects submitted for retrospective assessment was reported in respect of each year.
- ✓ Summary information, covering the five-year reporting cycle, on the nature of projects selected for retrospective assessment beyond those compulsory under Article 39(2) was reported.



Enforcement

- ✓ In respect of each year, Poland provided numbers for inspections, broken down by announced and unannounced.
- ✓ In respect of each year, Poland provided numbers for all active authorised breeders, suppliers and users separately.
- ✓ Qualitative operational information on the inspection process was reported.
- ✓ Poland indicated that the endorsed EU Inspection Risk Analysis Criteria was used as the basis for risk assessment.
- ✓ Information on suspensions or withdrawals of authorisations of breeders, suppliers and users, and the reasons therefore was reported.
- ✓ Information on reasons for the withdrawals of project authorisation was reported.
- ✓ Information on the nature of infringements, and on the nature of legal and administrative actions as a result of infringements was reported.
- ✗ Poland provided a web-address where any published material on inspections and enforcement may be found, but this web-address is no longer accessible.
- ✗ Detailed information on the inspection process, including the elements covered, was missing.
- ✗ The web-address where the criteria used for risk analysis can be found was not specified.
- ✗ Information on the criteria applied under Article 34(2) of the Directive was not reported.

Recommendations

Section E-2.2

Legal requirements

⚠ Provide summary information, covering the five-year reporting cycle, on **main findings of inspections**.

Examples of best practices

Report the **effectiveness in terms of impacts** such as declining trend in non-compliance; changes in risk profile of establishments; reduction in legal and administrative actions due to infringements.

*Recommendations continued***Best practices**

Regarding the **inspection process**, report:

- the **elements checked during inspections** (e.g. animal housing including ventilation, temperature, lighting, noise; housing conditions including availability of feed and water, stocking densities, bedding, hygiene, enrichment; animal health and care; reports summarising the health monitoring of laboratory animals; compliance of projects with the Directive; advice given by animal welfare bodies);
- the **number of inspectors and their expertise** and/or their (continuing) training;
- whether a **common check-list** is used during the inspection to ensure a coherent approach and to verify that all requirements are considered;
- whether **follow-up inspections** were carried out to ensure that reported deficiencies were resolved.

Provide the **correct web-address** where any published material on **inspections and enforcement** can be found.

Section E-2.3**Legal requirements**

Explain the measures taken to **ensure compliance with the requirements of Article 34(2)** of the Directive, which states that the **frequency of inspections should be adapted on the basis of a risk analysis** for each establishment, taking account of the number and species of animals housed; the record of the breeder, supplier or user in complying with the requirements of the Directive; the number and types of projects carried out by the user in question; and any information that might indicate non-compliance.

Best practices

Specify the **web-address where the criteria used for risk analysis** can be found.



Education & Training

- ✓ Poland reported that detailed information on the training program for functions mentioned in Article 23(2) is contained in the Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of May 5, 2015.
- ✓ The qualifications required for carrying out the functions set out in Article 23(2) were specified.
- ✓ Poland reported that persons carrying out functions referred to in points (a), (c) or (d) of Article 23(2) are supervised in the performance of their tasks until they have demonstrated the requisite competence.
- ✓ Poland reported that specific training requirements have been introduced for persons mentioned in Article 24.
- ✗ Poland did not specify the web-address where the Regulation of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of May 5, 2015 can be found.
- ✗ Summary information on the mandatory and/or optional courses and training for functions set out in Article 23(2) was missing.
- ✗ Poland did not provide information on the minimum requirements referred to in Article 23(3) on the basis of the elements set out in Annex V.

Recommendations

Section B-3

Legal requirements

Provide information on the **minimum requirements referred to in Article 23(3)** of the Directive, which states that Member States shall **publish, on the basis of the elements set out in Annex V, minimum requirements** with regard to education and training and the requirements for obtaining, maintaining and demonstrating requisite competence for the functions set out in Article 23(2).

Best practices

Specify the **web-address where the Regulation** of the Minister of Science and Higher Education of May 5, 2015 can be found.

Provide summary information on the **mandatory and/or optional courses and training** for functions mentioned in Article 23(2), including for example, the number of courses and training per year; the minimum duration of the courses and training; the content of the courses and training programmes; and the type of training (accredited and/or Member State approved, local or establishment training, other).



Genetically altered animals

- ✓ The number of animals bred, killed and not used in procedures including genetically altered animals not otherwise reported in the annual statistics was reported.
- ✓ Representative information on the efforts made to refine the methods of tissue sampling for the purposes of genetic characterisation carried out with and without project authorisation was provided.

Recommendations

Section D-3.2

Legal requirements

⚠ List the **criteria used** to ensure that the information in point D-3.1 is representative (i.e. information and numbers regarding species, methods and their related actual severity in respect of tissue sampling for the purposes of genetic characterisation carried out with and without project authorisation).

Examples of best practices

Report the **number of establishments** that were requested to provide information, as well as the **proportion that this represents** in relation to all establishments genotyping animals.



EU Guidance and Working Documents

- ✓ The EU Guidance on Animal Welfare Bodies and National Committees, the EU Guidance on Severity Assessment Framework, the EU Guidance on Project Evaluation and Retrospective Assessment, the EU Guidance on Inspections and Enforcement, the EU Guidance on Education and Training Framework and the Working Document on Genetically Altered Animals have been disseminated.

EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS

EUROGROUP FOR ANIMALS

Rue Ducale 29 – 1000 Brussels

Tel: +32 (0)2 740 08 20

info@eurogroupforanimals.org

eurogroupforanimals.org

© Eurogroup for Animals, June 2022

PUBLISHED BY

Eurogroup for Animals in June 2022

AUTHOR

Dr Luísa Bastos
Laurence Walder

EDITOR

Marie Cochet

DESIGN

Blush design agency

 [@Act4AnimalsEU](https://twitter.com/Act4AnimalsEU)

 [@eurogroupforanimals](https://www.facebook.com/eurogroupforanimals)

 [@eurogroup-for-animals](https://www.instagram.com/eurogroup-for-animals)

 [@eurogroupforanimals](https://www.linkedin.com/company/eurogroupforanimals)

