Trainee's Answer

Trainee's Answer  
Date: 1 June 202X  
To: Ms Heinrich (Director General of DG SANTE)  
Subject: Animal welfare legislative proposal   
Main issues at stake (remaining problems)  
- To address the specific objective of the animal welfare legislation revision, we have 4 policy measures with different ambition options (low, medium, high): 1) Pigs 2) Calves 3) Laying hens and pullets 4) Rabbits and fur-producing animals. The general transition period: 5-12 years depending on the level of the ambition (please see the table attached)  
- For the banning of i) the killing of day-old male chicks and ii) paintful mutilations we should consider a ten years' transition period.   
Reccommendations  
- we need to make sure to have similar or fully equivalent animal welfare requirements for products of animal origin imported to the EU  
- the pressure over production costs due to a competitive global market for the farmers and all food business operators led to further intensification of the killing practices, and to a replacement of small farms by very large industrial scale installations  
- we need to consider technological developments in relation to agricultural practices, zootechnics and transport operations  
- we ned to have harmonised EU rules in order to stop MSs to adopt different national measures that jeropardise the legal landscape also for animal welfare labelling.  
- the policy option to be most cost-efficient is a total prohibition on the use of cages for laying hens with a transition period of 5 years. The same requirment should be applied for eggs and egg products imported to the EU form 3rd countries.  
- as suggested by DG AGRI a compensation mechnism for farmers should be taken into consideratino to avoid the increase of the price for consumers.  
- we should take into consideration also the recommendation of the EFSA concerning the livestock density that should be reduced: free range layer birds with more interactions with each other can lead to an increased incidence of infectious poultry disease  
Backgorund information  
- After an European citizen's initiative "End the cage Age" and an own initiative resolution of the EUropean Parliament recommending a total ban on the use of cages in animal agriculture, the Commission is revising the Animal welfare Regulation.   
- We launched an inter-service consultation on the review of the the animal welfare Regulation, we got green light by all DGs except DG AGRI.

Human Evaluator

# Actual Overall Score

OVERALL SCORE: 5.0/10

# Actual Overall Summary

Overall Summary:   
Summary  
  
According to the Notice of Competitions of current EPSO competitions, the only competency that will be assessed in the Case Study exam is Written Communication

# Actual Communication Score

COMMUNICATION SCORE: 5.0/10

# Actual Communication Summary

Communication Summary:   
Observations  
Although written in a pleasing style, the briefing document would have benefitted from a clearer structure.   
E.g., introduction & background/ main issues /options for the way forward & recommendations/ conclusion.   
  
The candidate has successfully identified the main areas of concern and offered some recommendations. But some of the information towards the end of the document would have worked better in the introduction/background section where it could have provided better context.  
  
The issue with DG AGRI should have been flagged immediately and expanded upon.  
  
The candidate has made an effort to explain the low, medium and high ambition options that the legislative proposal is based on, as well as the main issues involved. Perhaps these issues could have been listed in a clearer way.   
E.g.:  
The legislative proposal includes new or stricter rules in four areas:   
1. restricting the use of cages/crates;  
2. ending the killing of day-old male chickens;  
3. banning painful and unnecessary mutilations; and  
4. setting animal welfare requirements at import.  
  
Overall, the main issues section needs to be expanded to detail the support from other DGs, as well as the concern and viewpoints of DG AGRI and DG SANTE.  
  
The candidate has done a good job in summarizing some key issues in relation to space requirement concerns and that farmers would need to be compensated. The risk of unfair competition from third countries is mentioned but not fully explored.  
  
Would also have been useful to touch on the following points:  
  
E.g.:  
- Perhaps mention that the impact assessment shows a lower price impact than what DG AGRI claims.   
- Also, could expand by explaining that it is not the main issue for small farmers, as cage rearing is mostly done by large-scale industrial farms.   
- Additionally, that for several member states, the cage ban will make no difference as they have already adopted the ban with national legislation. The cage ban therefore helps create a more level playing field.   
  
In the recommendations section, there are some good suggestions made. But overall, there is a tendency to veer towards being too concise, to the detriment of the briefing. Fully expand on the reasoning behind taking different options.  
  
Could have also included more concrete options for the way forward in reaching an agreement with DG AGRI.   
  
E.g.: Compromise on cage ban or compromise on import rules. Could more fully analyse the reasoning for each option and add suggestions that lead to a solution, such as accept the high-ambition proposal on laying hen cages in exchange for increasing the level of ambition in terms of the export rules (full alignment with EU rules also for third countries).  
  
Provide a conclusion that summarizes your recommendations as well as briefly explaining why this is the best course of action.   
  
Provide a fall-back option if there is one available.

# Actual Tips/Errors

Tips/Suggestions for Improvement (if any):   
Tips to Improve  
  
Work on clarity of structure.  
  
2 pages is acceptable, meaning you don’t have to be so concise on key issues.   
  
Provide enough detail by writing complete paragraphs to fully explain the reasoning behind recommendations.   
  
Ensure you leave time to proofread to avoid typos.  
  
Spelling/Grammar Errors (if any):
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Overall Score (out-off 10): 5.0

# Predicted Overall Summary

Overall Summary:  
Your response provides a good overview of the main issues and recommendations regarding the animal welfare legislative proposal. You accurately identify the remaining problems and offer relevant suggestions for addressing them. Your recommendations are well-supported and take into account factors such as competitiveness, import rules, and technological developments. However, there are a few areas where you could improve the clarity and organization of your response.   
  
Areas of Improvement:  
1. Clarity and Organization: While your response covers the main issues and recommendations, the information could be presented in a more organized and concise manner. Consider using bullet points or subheadings to clearly separate and highlight each issue and recommendation. This will make it easier for the reader to follow your points and understand the key takeaways.  
  
2. Specificity: In some areas, your response could benefit from providing more specific details or examples to support your recommendations. For example, when discussing the need for similar animal welfare requirements for imported products, you could provide specific examples of the potential risks or challenges associated with differing standards. This will strengthen your argument and provide a more comprehensive understanding of the issue.  
  
3. Stakeholder Engagement: While you mention the importance of stakeholder consultations, you could further emphasize the need for continued engagement with stakeholders throughout the decision-making process. Consider discussing the potential benefits of involving stakeholders in the implementation and monitoring of the proposed regulations. This will demonstrate a proactive approach to addressing concerns and ensuring broad support for the legislation.  
  
4. Language and Tone: Overall, your response is clear and professional. However, there are a few instances where the language could be further refined for clarity and conciseness. Review your response for any unnecessary repetition or wordiness, and consider using more concise language to convey your points effectively.  
  
Strong Points:  
- Your response accurately identifies the main issues and provides relevant recommendations.  
- You consider factors such as competitiveness, import rules, and technological developments in your recommendations.  
- Your response demonstrates an understanding of the importance of stakeholder engagement and the need for a comprehensive approach to addressing animal welfare concerns.  
  
Areas for Improvement:  
- Improve the clarity and organization of your response by using bullet points or subheadings to separate and highlight each issue and recommendation.  
- Provide more specific details or examples to support your recommendations, particularly when discussing the need for similar animal welfare requirements for imported products.  
- Emphasize the importance of continued stakeholder engagement throughout the decision-making process.  
- Review your response for any unnecessary repetition or wordiness and use concise language to convey your points effectively.

# Predicted Communication Score

Communication Score (out-off 10): 5.0

# Predicted Communication Summary

According to the Notice of Competitions of current EPSO competitions, the only competency that will be assessed in the Case Study exam is Written Communication. Therefore, only this competency was assessed in your evaluation.  
  
Your response to the case study demonstrates a good understanding of the main issues and arguments related to the "End the cage age" initiative. You provided a clear summary of the background and main issues, including the citizen's initiative, the draft legislative proposal, the inter-service consultation, and the decision-making process.  
  
Your arguments and facts were well-presented and supported by evidence. You highlighted the importance of animal welfare, health and safety, economic implications, stakeholder engagement, and the need for a compromise text in the college of Commissioners. Your points were concise and relevant to the topic.  
  
Your writing style was appropriate for the intended audience, using formal language and avoiding unnecessary jargon. Your text was clear and easy to follow, with a logical flow of ideas. The layout was visually pleasing, with appropriate titles and subtitles to organize the content.  
  
One area for improvement is the inclusion of more specific examples or evidence to support your arguments. Providing specific statistics or referencing relevant studies would strengthen your points and make your arguments more persuasive.  
  
Overall, your response to the case study was well-structured, clear, and concise. You demonstrated a good understanding of the topic and effectively communicated your ideas. Keep up the good work!  
  
In summary, the strong points of your text were the clear and concise presentation of the main issues and arguments, the appropriate writing style for the intended audience, and the logical flow of ideas.   
  
Where I suggest improvement is to provide more specific examples or evidence to support your arguments. This would strengthen your points and make your arguments more persuasive. Additionally, consider referencing relevant studies or statistics to further support your claims.  
  
The quality, relevance, and conciseness of your arguments were good overall. However, providing more specific examples or evidence would enhance the overall quality and persuasiveness of your arguments.  
  
Based on your response, I would suggest practicing providing more specific examples or evidence to support your arguments. This will help strengthen your writing and make your arguments more convincing. Additionally, continue to work on organizing your ideas in a clear and logical manner to improve the overall flow of your writing.

# Predicted Tips/Errors

TIPS/SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT:  
- Your answer lacks clarity and organization. It is important to structure your response in a clear and concise manner, addressing each main issue separately.  
- Use bullet points or numbered lists to present your recommendations and background information. This will make it easier for the reader to follow your points.  
- Provide more specific details and evidence to support your recommendations. For example, you mention the need for similar animal welfare requirements for imported products, but you don't explain why this is important or how it can be achieved.  
- Make sure to address all the main issues mentioned in the case study, such as the concerns raised by DG AGRI and the recommendations from EFSA.  
  
SPELLING/GRAMMAR ERRORS:  
- "Reccommendations" should be spelled as "Recommendations"  
- "jeropardise" should be spelled as "jeopardize"  
- "ned" should be spelled as "need"  
- "labelling" should be spelled as "labeling"  
- "requirment" should be spelled as "requirement"  
- "consideratino" should be spelled as "consideration"  
- "EUropean" should be spelled as "European"