

Statement of the German Juridical Society for Animal Welfare Law e.V. (DJGT) in matters of the handling of stray dogs in Romania

Summary

According to media reports and various witness statements, at this time, a great amount of dogs are captured and, subsequently, killed in so-called animal shelters in many cities of Romania – particularly in Bucharest. The dogs are generally caught by nooses that are put around their necks, thus causing them serious pain and affliction. Also, dogs are caught that are obviously the property of someone, an owner who is in charge and takes care of them. Government measures to limit the population of dogs by registering, marking, and sterilizing are rarely conducted. Owners, whose dogs are caught have great difficulty picking them up from public shelters. The killing of the captured animals is usually carried out 14 days after the catching.

The Romanian government has induced this practice by its decision in September on the aggravation of the ordinance in matters of the handling of stray dogs. They thus violate the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals (ECPPA) and the directive of the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE). In addition, the capturing and killing of dogs under ownership and the difficulties that are caused the owners picking up their dogs from the public shelters violate the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). The principle of law of commensurability that underlies all these conventions is violated in multiple regards, inter alia by offering catch premiums that favor the capture of trusting and non-dangerous dogs, that the shelters are not in accordance with the OIE minimum requirements, that painful methods of extermination are applied when milder and more suitable available methods are not considered.

The Federal Republic of Germany and all European countries that have ratified the ECPPA are entitled and obligated to remind the contractual partner Romania of their adherence to their commitment to obey the obligations of the international law. It is the EU Commission's duty, among others, to ensure that no practices in the handling of animals that run contrary to the common European understanding of the human being-animal relationship (expressed, among others, article 13 Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union TFEU) are (co-)financed by aid money of the EU budget. Romania is a beneficiary of

Reinhardtstraße 3
10117 Berlin
Tel.: +49 (0)30-400 54 68 20
Fax: +49 (0)30-400 54 68 69
info@djgt.de
<http://www.djgt.de>

Berlin, 03.02.2014

Der Verein ist durch vorläufige
Bescheinigung des Finanz-
amtes Münster-Innenstadt
(St-Nr.: 337/5975/0365) vom
25.11.2011 als gemeinnützig
anerkannt.

Spenden und Beiträge sind
steuerlich abzugsfähig.

Sparkasse Münsterland Ost
Bankleitzahl 400 501 50
Konto 0000 496 448

IBAN: DE84
4005 0150 0000 4964 48

Seite 1 von 16 BIC: WELADED1MST

numerous European funds (or subsidies), notably in the frame of the European Agricultural Fund; we assume that payments to the shelters, which deal with the captured animals as described above, are taken from those funds. The EU Commission should no longer expect the tax payers of the Union to accept that their funds are used for (direct or indirect) measures in Romania that cause unreasonable pain and suffering to animals and thus violate basic values of the European Union law.

The DJGT first and foremost addresses the German government, the Council of Europe and the EU Commission with the subsequent elaboration. Moreover, they provide their arguments to all organizations and individuals who want to plead before the federal government, other European governments, the EU Commission and other adequate institutions, that in Romania, the ECPPA, the OIE guidelines and the ECHR will be followed and complied with (again).

Expert advice/report

Contents

I.	Facts	4
1.	Capture of stray dogs	5
2.	Origin of the animals.....	5
3.	Boarding of animals in public shelters	6
4.	Killing of shelter animals	7
5.	Bounties.....	7
II.	Judicial appraisal	8
1.	Relevant contents of the ECCPA	8
a)	Definitions.....	8
b)	Regulations for the euthanasia of pet animals	9
c)	Regulations for the boarding/housing of animals	9
d)	Reduction of the number of stray animals	9
2.	Relevant contents of the OIE guidelines concerning the handling of stray dogs	9
3.	Relevant contents of the Romanian Ordinance.....	10
4.	Relevant regulations as for the protection of property.....	10
5.	Violations of the aforementioned legal foundations.....	10
a)	Violation of the Romanian Ordinance and, respectively, the practice against the ECCPA described above	10
aa)	Capture method	11
bb)	Capture also of non-straying animals	11
cc)	Animal euthanasia.....	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
dd)	Keeping of the animals	12
ee)	Infringement against the principle of proportionality (art. 12 lit. b ECCPA)	12
ff)	No applicability of art. 13 ECCPA	13
gg)	Result	Fehler! Textmarke nicht definiert.
b)	Violation of the OIE guidelines	14
c)	Violation of the ECHR with regard to the protection of proprietary right	14
III.	Thoughts about international and European law	15
1.	Duties and rights according to international law	15
2.	Obligations of the Commission by the European Law.....	15

I. Facts

In Romania, as well as in other European countries, there is a large number of stray dogs living on the streets. Their previous owners generally abandoned them unneutered, many are descendants/offspring of stray dogs, or are allowed by their owners to roam the streets during the day, although unneutered. In this respect, human error plays an essential part in the stray dogs epidemic.

In recent years, a considerable number of domestic national and international humane societies and animal-welfare organizations have carried out extensive neuter/spay programs of stray dogs¹. Through the cooperation of community representatives and local veterinarians, the communities of Pitesti, a district of Arges², and Oradea³, among others, succeeded in significantly reducing the number of stray dogs in their areas/districts by perennial neuter/spay programs. The Romanian Government has not supported any of these programs. On the contrary, the number of stray dogs that animal-welfare organizations at home and abroad could assist is being hampered and any positive advancements are set back by the recurring illegal mass killings; which even put dogs that are already neutered and registered at risk. Animal humane societies' concrete offers to help to achieve a sustainable reduction of stray dogs were not accepted by the Romanian Government⁴.

The severity of the situation in Romania increased after the installation of a new ordinance in September 2013, according to which any stray dog in a public shelter, captured and unclaimed by the owner in two weeks, will be killed.

¹ See for example: <http://www.lokalkompass.de/dortmund-city/natur/das-unendliche-leid-der-strassentiere-rumaeniens-d338874.html>.

² According to information provided by the animal humane society *Tierhilfe Hoffnung e. V.* (<http://www.tierhilfe-hoffnung.com/>), the number of free, uncastrated dogs was reduced from 31,004 in 2007 to 4,130 free, castrated dogs on 1 June 2013. 18,107 dogs were castrated, 13,829 dogs were adopted, and 10,849 dogs died in this timeframe.

³ Also according to the animal humane society *Tierhilfe Hoffnung e. V.* (<http://www.tierhilfe-hoffnung.com/>), the number of stray dogs of 6,000 in Oradea (21,000 inhabitants) in 2003 was reduced to a mere 350 dogs in 2008 through castrations; and according to the animal humane society FOUR PAWS Romania, the stray dog problem could sustainably be solved in Dej with the aid of the municipality.

⁴ FOUR PAWS Romania, Save the Dogs, and a working group of the Veterinary College presented proposals including a national action plan to reduce the population; to date, there were no reactions on the part of the authorities.

The media as well as reports by animal welfare organisations explain how the stray dogs in Romania are currently handled⁵:

1. Capture of stray dogs

Initially, the animals are captured. For this purpose, nooses are thrown around their necks (often while the animals are still running) and pulled tightly to prevent the animals' escape. Additionally, they use thick wooden sticks. Then, with uttermost brutality, the dogs are carried off to vehicles specifically purchased for this purpose. In this procedure bone fractures and other physical injuries are callously accepted. Methods such as these lead to events such as that on 12 November 2013; a dog in Pitesti, about to be captured by two veterinarians with a tranquilizer gun and a noose, panicked and ran into a car and had to be euthanized due to a fracture of the spinal column. Another dog, on 23 November 2013, also in Pitesti, suffered injuries in its pharyngeal zone to such an extent that the surgical extraction of teeth became inevitable⁶.

2. Origen of the animals

Not only dogs categorized as “stray animals” are being captured, in fact, even those animals that obviously have a home and are cared for regularly are affected by these measures. On 30 September 2013, in a broadcast featured on “Spiegel-TV”⁷, individuals involved are resisting by stating, inter alia, “Don't take the dog from us... this dog was raised in our home... I have the required documents.”

Another case showed a woman sitting in front of her own home holding a dog tightly in her arms, affirming that the dog belonged to her household. Regardless, the dogcatchers tried to forcibly remove the dog from its owner. After the woman had fled into her home with the dog, they even followed her inside.

⁵ Cf. e. g.: <http://www.spiegel.de/video/jagd-auf-strassenhunde-unterwegs-mit-rumaenischen-tierfaengern-video-1299630.html> und <http://www.spiegel.tv/filme/hunde-shitstorm-bukarest/>
<http://www.daserste.de/information/politik-weltgeschehen/weltspiegel/sendung/br/rumaenien-hundemord-100.html>; <http://www.lokalkompass.de/dortmund-city/natur/das-unendliche-leid-der-strassentiere-rumaeniens-d338874.html> and e.g. <http://www.tasso.net/Tierschutz/Aktionen/Strassenhunde>; <http://www.bmt-tierschutz.de/das-toeten-in-rumanien-hat-begonnen/>; <http://www.veganblog.de/2013/09/04/gedanken-zum-tragischen-beissvorfall-in-rumaenien/>.

⁶ This derives from information provided by the animal humane society *Tierhilfe Hoffnung e. V.* (<http://www.tierhilfe-hoffnung.com/>) to the DJGT.

⁷ <http://www.spiegel.de/video/jagd-auf-strassenhunde-unterwegs-mit-rumaenischen-tierfaengern-video-1299630.html>.

In a further case, there was a small dog, trustingly lying on his back, petted by a kiosk owner who obviously looked after him. In spite of the woman's presence, the dogcatchers threw a noose around the dog's neck and dragged him away without paying attention to the kiosk owner's protest.

An additional news report showed how the dog of a woman in Bucharest was caught and taken away regardless of her objections because the dog was sojourning, unleashed, in the yard in front of her home. This dog was also neutered and micro-chipped, thus verifiably owned and provided for by the woman.

For a news report on the German television program "ARD Morgenmagazin", reporter Susanne Glass was allowed to accompany dogcatchers in Bucharest. A dog was shown lying on a dog blanket on a doorstep, his ear tag was clearly visible and apparently he was supplied with dog food. The dogcatchers captured this dog using a sling/noose and hauled him off into their transport vehicle.

3. Boarding of animals in public shelters

Dogs that are placed in public shelters are kept under abysmal hygienic conditions, without regard to their temperaments and emotional states and without or without sufficient food and water. Given that most of the stray dogs are already weakened, many survive only a few days due to a lack of adequate provisions. In addition, the injuries resulting from securing the canine are not treated⁸. The individuals responsible for the shelters are visibly anxious to conceal the conditions from the public and there is evidence that extensive pain and suffering is inflicted upon the animals in the shelters as well. Susanne Glass, the aforementioned reporter, was notified that she was to be admitted for a visit to the public shelter in Bucharest; upon her arrival, she waited for hours and ultimately gave up as she was refused admission. Dog transports that had arrived while she was waiting were not unloaded, apparently to impede news coverage and dog owners, who wanted to pick up their animals, were bullied by particularly long wait times. A subsequent media report from the German media made it known that sometimes the owners have to sign a paper of adoption of the dog even though the owners have proof of ownership upon arriving to pick up their dog.

⁸ This derives from information provided by the animal humane society *Tierhilfe Hoffnung e. V.* (<http://www.tierhilfe-hoffnung.com/>) to the DJGT.

4. Killing of shelter animals

According to testimony of the Romanian humane society, the dogs taken into public shelters are not euthanized in a humane way and in a pain free manner. The dogs are executed by, among other means, electrocution and the injection of anti-freezing agents, or the like⁹. It was identified in different news reports in German media that the reporters were not allowed to be present when a dog was euthanized.

5. Bounties

According to media reports, the city of Bucharest has a budget of 18 million Ron (approximately 4.2 million Euros) at its disposal for public shelters, of which a merely 2 million Ron (approximately 470,000 Euros) are in fact supposed to be utilized for the maintenance of the shelters.

According to current reports, it is assumed that the remainder of these public funds are used for bounty payments. Respectively, bounties as high as 50-250 Euros are paid per dog turned in to a shelter¹⁰. In comparison, the average monthly pension amounts to about 100.00 Euros and average net wages are 354.53 Euros¹¹.

⁹ This derives from information provided by the animal humane society *Tierhilfe Hoffnung e. V.* (<http://www.tierhilfe-hoffnung.com/>) to the DJGT; cf. also a report at <http://www.n-tv.de/suche/?at=all&q=rumanien>.

¹⁰ S. Glass, ARD Morgenmagazin, 5 November 2013: the animal capture company receives 50 EUR per dog caught.

¹¹ http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/DE/Aussenpolitik/Laender/Laenderinfos/01-Nodes_Uebersichtsseiten/Rumaenien_node.html, Stand Dezember 2011.

II. Judicial appraisal

Romania is party to the contract of the European Convention for the Protection of Pet Animals¹² (consecutively ECPPA).

Moreover, the World Organization for Animal Health (consecutively OIE) has created guidelines for the handling of stray dogs¹³.

On December 13, 2001 an ordinance concerning the handling of stray dogs was issued in Romania¹⁴. A modification and addendum was concluded on September 10, 2013¹⁵ (consecutively Romanian ordinance).

The right of ownership is protected in article 1 of the Additional Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR).

The practice described above violates the ECPPA, the OIE guidelines and the ECHR.

1. Relevant contents of the ECPPA

a) Definitions

As per article 1 para. 1 ECPPA, a pet is "any animal kept or intended to be kept by man in particular in his household for private enjoyment and companionship". A pet does not lose this classification due to abandonment or becoming a stray. This is due to article 1 para. 5, according to which a stray animal is also a pet; "By a stray animal is meant a pet animal which either has no home or is outside the bounds of its owner's or keeper's household and is not under the control or direct supervision of any owner or keeper".

¹² Romania signed the Convention on 23 June 2003. The ratification took place on 6 August 2004 without reservation. It became effective in Romania on 1 March 2005.

¹³ 7.6 of the Terrestrial Animal Health Code (available at <http://www.oie.int/en/international-standard-setting/terrestrial-code/access-online/>).

¹⁴ Government Emergency Ordinance no. 155/2001 on the approval of stray dogs management program

¹⁵ Law amending and supplementing the Government Emergency Ordinance no. 155/2001.

b) Regulations for the euthanasia of pet animals

As for the euthanasia of pet animals, article 11 ECPPA applies, that it has to be done "with the minimum of physical and mental suffering appropriate to the circumstances". Certain euthanasia measures are explicitly prohibited, inter alia euthanasia through electric power or by suffocation.

c) Regulations for the boarding/housing of animals

According to article 4 ECPPA, the individual who keeps or takes care of a pet animal has to provide accommodation, care and attention in a way that is in accordance with the ethological needs of the animal with consideration for its health and breed. In particular, the keeper must offer sufficient suitable food and water.

d) Reduction of the number of stray animals

According to article 12 ECCPA, only those "appropriate legislative and/or administrative measures" are allowed to be taken in order to decrease the number of stray animals that are "necessary to reduce their numbers in a way which does not cause avoidable pain, suffering or distress". Moreover, article 12 lit. a i) envisages that the capture of stray animals has to occur – taking into account the nature of the animal – minimal measure of physical and psychological suffering. Both the keeping and killing of captured stray animals must happen "in accordance with the principles laid down in this Convention" (art. 4 and art. 11) as per article 12 lit. a) ii). Finally, the parties to the contract obligate themselves to "reducing the unplanned breeding of dogs and cats by promoting the neutering of these animals" (article 12 lit. a). According to article 13 ECCPA, exceptions to the principles laid down in article 12 ECCPA "may be made only if unavoidable in the framework of national disease control programmes."

2. Relevant contents of the OIE guidelines concerning the handling of stray dogs

The OIE guidelines state that certain minimum requirements have to be met as for the keeping of animals. Thus, captured animals have to be provided with fresh water and nutritious food. In addition, hygienic conditions have to be

supplied and the necessary medical treatments have to be arranged in those facilities. With regard to the reduction of the population of stray dogs, the OIE guidelines indicate that the euthanizing of animals is not an efficient means and shall be applied at the most in connection with other measures limiting the population (see art. 7.7.6 point 5 of Terrestrial Animal Health Code).

3. Relevant contents of the Romanian Ordinance

The Romanian ordinance, according to the amended version, particularly states that captured dogs are killed after being held in a shelter for 14 days or after not being picked up by their owner or adopted by another person (art. 7 para. 2). It is even allowed to catch dogs that have a microchip or are marked otherwise (art. 1). As per article 5, euthanasia is an act of quick and painless killing. On the contrary, no. 20 para. 3 defines that the euthanasia has to occur correspondent to the guidelines of the handbook for the euthanasia of animals, as conceded by the College of veterinarians. Those allow dogs to be euthanized using carbon dioxides, carbon oxides, potassium chlorides, nitrogen, electrocution, captive bolts.

4. Relevant regulations as for the protection of property

As per art. 1 of the Additional Protocol to the ECHR, nobody can be deprived of his or her property unless required by the public interest, and only under the (pre)conditions designed by the law and general principles of the international law. Consequently, interventions are only allowed to be carried out at a predominant public interest and only if the legal principle of proportionality is protected/met.

5. Violations of the aforementioned legal foundations

a) Violation of the Romanian Ordinance and, respectively, the practice against the ECCPA described above

Through the ratification of the ECCPA, Romania has accepted the responsibility under international law to fulfill this agreement. This obligation applies to the legislative and executive in equal measure, thus has to be considered both in legislative processes and in the administration practice.

aa) Capture method

The capture using nooses is not the mildest method as is regulated by art. 12 ECCPA. In fact, the loops are often thrown around the necks of the dogs that are still moving and are then forcefully pulled tight. This procedure causes the dogs pain and suffering, which could be prevented by other, by far milder and nonviolent catching methods, and by especially trained personnel, as do the animal humane organizations.

bb) Capture also of non-straying animals

Art. 12 ECCPA only allows measures against stray animals, according to the definition in art. 1 para. 5 ECCPA against animals that either do not have a home or sojourn outside of the limits of the household of their owners or keepers and that are not under their control or immediate supervision. As a consequence to the bounties as high as 50 Euro per dog, even dogs that are immediately in front of their owner's or keeper's home or otherwise identifiably under their control are caught. So, the bounty and thus the induced practice constitute an infringement of art. 12 ECCPA.

cc) Animal euthanasia

The effort of the public shelters' leaderships to impede reports on the killing measures employed by them is sufficient evidence that they do not exert the mildest killing processes to euthanize the animals (e.g. injection of a overdose of the anesthetic Pentobarbital, and not T 61). This constitutes a violation of art. 11 ECCPA. The euthanasia methods envisioned in the guidelines (manual) for the euthanasia of animals - approved by the college of veterinarians - that are supposed to be implemented according to No. 20 of the Romanian ordinance, infringe art. 11 ECCPA as well. They allow euthanasia by suffocation without immediate loss of consciousness by using carbon dioxide or nitrogen or killing by electrocution, and thus violate art. 11 para. 2 lit. a and lit. c ECCPA, respectively. It also becomes clear that the killing is not executed by the mildest manner because art. 11 para. 1 calls for the cooperation with animal humane societies and foundations capturing, boarding, eliminating parasites, vaccinating, castrating, and claiming for the return/adoption, but not for the presence of these organizations at the killings.

dd) Keeping of the animals

The aforementioned keeping of the animals in public shelters violates art. 12 lit. a) ii) in connection with art. 4 para. 2 letter a) ECCPA.

ee) Infringement against the principle of proportionality (art. 12 lit. b ECCPA)

Moreover, art. 12 lit. b ECCPA obligates the contracting parties to consider milder measures before euthanizing stray animals, i.e. they have to at least consider other options. This request is a characteristic of the legal principle of proportionality, which obligates the implementation of the mildest measure of those in consideration. Hence, euthanasia is at best allowed and executed if the respective state has previously tried unsuccessfully to counter the prevalence of stray animals through castration programs, identification and registration of animals (in order to prevent abandonments). The changed Romanian ordinance stipulates in art. 8 para. 1 that the captured dogs are only allowed to be handed over sterilized to their previous or new owners; it emanates that even the Romanian legislature acknowledges the sterilization of the dogs as a suitable means for the reduction of the population.

Meanwhile, this finding in conjunction with the principle of proportionality should lead to the concession that measures such as castration, sterilization, marking and registration should take priority before euthanasia. But this is neither the case according to the literal ordinance nor in practice although these measures, consequently conducted, have been successful in the aforementioned municipalities, while killing activities over decades have not solved the problem. Activities regarding castrations, identification and registration of dogs have taken place in Romania, but (almost) exclusively on the part of animal humane societies organized under private law and without the noteworthy support of the Romanian government.

ff) No applicability of art. 13 ECCPA

Art. 13 ECCPA, which allows for exceptions in the capture, keeping and killing of stray animals, is not relevant legislation a priori because it does not deal with the combat of diseases in the sense as displayed in the article. The directive to only deviate from the principles of the convention such as in the case of inevitable events and inevitable degree would not even be complied with if one incorrectly subsumed dog bites under the term “disease” – above all if no governmental measures as defined by art. 12 lit. b ECCPA were enacted previously.

gg) Result

Thereby, the content of the Romanian ordinance already infringes on art. 12 lit. b ii of the ECCPA because the Romanian legislature disregards the principle of proportionality as alluded to. It does not become evident at any point in the ordinance to which extent the reduction of the dimension of the unplanned reproduction of dogs through the promotion of sterilizations has been considered; which programs have been determined and implemented by the Romanian government; which results these programs showed; and why killings in terms of the ultima ratio principle have been endorsed as necessary as a last instrument¹⁶. The order in art. 8 para. 1 of the Romanian ordinance to only hand out sterilized animals to their owners does not satisfy the principle of proportionality.

The reference in art. 20 para. 3 of the ordinance to the killing methods of the manual for the euthanasia of animals, as conceded by the veterinary college, violates art. 11 ECCPA.

Moreover, the actual handling of the dogs, notably provoked by the offer of a bounty is a perpetual infringement of art. 12 ECCPA. The completely inadequate endowment of the public shelters conflicts with art. 4 ECCPA.

¹⁶ Nevertheless, the term euthanasia is used in a contradictory way in art. 7 of the Romanian ordinance, as euthanasia in its literal sense means the deliverance from pain and suffering, and thus cannot be applied to healthy or curable animals.

b Violation of the OIE guidelines

Romania is a full member of the OIE and thus bound to the guidelines of the OIE.

The dogs do not have access to sufficient fresh water nor nutritious food in the shelters they are taken to, nor are they looked after or treated medically. The boarding serves the euthanasia in the first place instead of other measures limiting the population such as castration and sterilization. Owners and holders who want to reclaim/pick up their animals are bullied and the conditions are made more difficult. Efforts to arrange for adoptions of dogs to a third person in order to save them from euthanasia are not made. Overall, the shelters do not comply with the minimum requirements of art. 7.7.6 of the Terrestrial Health Code of the OIE.

Moreover, the OIE guidelines also envisage a hierarchy of methods corresponding with the principle of proportionality: Killings as the only method to reduce the number of stray animals is regarded as unsuitable (art. 7.7.6 point 5), thus should only be considered as accompanying and last measure if prior to this, sterilization programs and activities to prevent abandonments have been conducted, but remained unsuccessful.

b) Violation of the ECHR with regard to the protection of proprietary right

Since not only abandoned dogs are captured, the protected freedom of property as in art. 1 of the Additional Protocol to the ECHR has to be adhered to. Exactly the indifferent offering of a bounty has as a result that rather those dogs are caught that have an owner than those are generally more trusting and more peaceful as abandoned animals. The capture of such animals infringes/violates the protection of property of the ECHR.

III. Thoughts about international and European law

1. Duties and rights according to international law

The changed Romanian ordinance, and particularly the practice of managing stray dogs for which the Romanian government is responsible, contradicts the provisions of the ECCPA.

The ECCPA does not enable to monitor of the “enforcement” of the stipulated duties, but it is expected that the members transpose the content of the respective convention signed. However, there is the possibility (art. 15 para. 1 ECCPA) to convene a so-called multilateral consultation at any time, with the objective to review the implementation of the treaty/agreement in each individual contracting state. The Council of Europe should use and strengthen this procedure at the latest in the current situation of Romania, criticized by a vast majority of citizens all over Europe

2. Obligations of the Commission by the European Law

Even though the EU has not acceded to the ECCPA and has not issued their own regulations as of how to handle pet animals, shared values and a cultural order of the European Union as of how to handle animals result/emanate from article 13 TFEU, which attributes an intrinsic value to the animals, and from the international agreements on animal welfare, ratified by the EU. A pivotal section in these agreements determines that it is not allowed to inflict pain, suffering and harm upon animals in a disproportionate way. The EU Commission watches over the compliance with these shared values and the cultural order.

Furthermore, Romania receives funds within the scope of numerous EU funding/support programs. It is commensurate to reality that a part of these public funds (e.g. by the European Agricultural Fund) is used for shelters or that EU funds for different intended purposes cause that Romanian funds are set free for this practice.]. Accordingly, there are concerns that a part of the funds, out of which the bounties are paid and the public shelters maintained, might come from the EU. It is to the most important task of the EU Commission to proceed the budget plan of the Union and /monitor the member states if they use the funds provided to them adequately, in a transparent way and in conformity to the values of the Union.

On that account, the EU Commission is obligated to call to attention the identified shortcomings to the Romanian government and to particularly ensure an immediate end to the payment of bounties as well as an international control of the public shelters. The EU Commission should also point out further violations of the ECCPA, the OIE guidelines and the ECHR and ensure that all these obligations are met in the future.