

Q&A

06/05/2022

Reference: Call for proposals
Development of non-aversive
stunning methods for pigs
SMP-FOOD-2022-PigStunning

Question 1

In the implementation phase it says: “The beneficiary will experiment the alternatives proposed in the planning phase into pre-selected slaughterhouses and collect the scientific, technical and socio-economic data.” Although this refers to three alternatives mentioned in the earlier phases, it does not specify that the alternatives should be tested in three different countries. So: can the alternatives be tested in two previously identified slaughterhouses both situated in one country?

The section of the Call Document entitled “2. Objectives — Themes and priorities — Activities that can be funded — Expected impact” does not specify the detailed arrangements on how many methods should be tested in how many countries. On the other hand, the section entitled “6. Eligibility” specifies under the paragraph on geographic location that “Proposals must relate to activities taking place in at least three EU Member States chosen among the top six in terms of number of pig slaughtered: Germany, Spain, France, Poland, Netherlands, Denmark.”

There is a certain flexibility in the way activities can be organised, provided that they correspond to the general objective of the call. It should be noted that the level of diversity of situations under which the alternatives are tested will affect the evaluation of the proposals as part of the award criteria 1 and 2.



Question 2

The implementation phase also says: “This phase will consist in implementing of alternatives under commercial conditions and the collection of the pre-selected data.” Will it be acceptable to test the three alternatives on a commercial line, but for relatively short periods outside the normal commercial operations of the slaughterhouse?

There is no provision in the call prohibiting the practice of testing alternatives for a short period of time necessary for the implementation phase. We understand that the implementation phase by itself will generate constraints that are not fully compatible with the usual practices of slaughterhouses. It remains important that alternatives are tested in situations as close as possible to commercial conditions. In this way, the results can be used to encourage other slaughterhouses to apply the alternatives. If conditions of the implementation phase are too remote from commercial conditions, the credibility of the alternatives to be implemented in practice will be negatively affected.

Question 3

Not all abattoirs will be able to convert and test a new system in the next two years. Will our proposal be eligible if not all the specifications of the call are met (e.g. less slaughter companies and/or less phases completed)?

Proposal complying with the provisions specified in section 6 of the Call Document on “Eligible participants (eligible countries)” and “Consortium composition” will be considered eligible.

Applicants must be legal entities (public or private bodies) and be established in one of the eligible countries (EU Member States; including overseas countries and territories (OCTs) or non-EU countries (EFTA and EEA countries: Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Switzerland; candidate countries).

Proposals must be submitted by a consortium of at least three applicants (beneficiaries; not affiliated entities), which complies with the following conditions: minimum three entities from three different eligible countries and at least two entities shall be business operators and at least one entity shall be research centre or academic institution.

Question 4

...”Is there any chance the deadline will be pushed back?”

The decision to extend the deadline may be potentially taken by the authorising officer in full respect of the principle of equal treatment between applicants.